# Waterland

## An Answer to Dr. Whitby's Reply

D-7
W2993

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
3.11.43
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SCC
1644

Dr. *WATERLAND*'s

# ANSWER

TO

Dr. *WHITBY*'s REPLY,

Reſpecting his Book Intituled

DISQUISITIONES MODESTÆ.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
D-7
W2993

# AN ANSWER TO Dr WHITBY'S Reply,

BEING A

# VINDICATION

OF THE

CHARGE of FALLACIES, MISQUOTATIONS, MISCONSTRUCTIONS, MISREPRESENTATIONS, &c.

Respecting his Book Intituled

## DISQUISITIONES MODESTÆ.

*In a* LETTER *to Dr.* WHITBY.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON 1943 SEMINARY

By *DANIEL WATERLAND*, D.D.
MASTER of *Magdalen-College*, in CAMBRIDGE, and CHAPLAIN in Ordinary to His *MAJESTY*.

*Faithful are the Wounds of a Friend.* Prov. 27. 6.

*CAMBRIDGE:*
Printed for CORN. CROWNFIELD, Printer to the *University*: And are to be Sold by JAMES KNAPTON, ROBERT KNAPLOCK, in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, and WILLIAM TAYLOR, in *Pater-Noster*-Row, *LONDON*. MDCCXX.

*SIR,*

I HAVE read over your *Reply*, lately publiſh'd. I perceive, you are much diſturbed at the Freedom I took with you, in That Part of my *Defenſe* which concern'd You: And tho' you have, for ſeveral Years laſt paſt, been acting the part of a *Cenſor*, and a ſevere one too (if we conſider the *Intention*, rather than the *Effect*) upon many great, good, and learned Men, Antient and Modern; yet when it comes to be your own Caſe to be animadverted upon (however juſtly, and upon a neceſſary Occaſion) you are not able to bear it with due Temper of Mind. I am very unwilling to give you any farther Diſturbance: And, indeed, were your *Reply* to be read only by *Men of Letters*, I ſhould not have a Thought of returning any Anſwer to it. But ſince the Controverſy, about the ever Bleſſed Trinity, is now ſpread among all Kinds of Readers, I have judged it neceſſary, in ſo momentous a Cauſe, to take ſome Notice of what you have done, for the ſake of ſome well-meaning Men who might otherwiſe happen to be impoſed upon by it.

You divide your Work into two Parts, *Defenſive* and *Offenſive*: The *Firſt*, to take off (ſo far as you are able) what I had Charged you with; The *Second*, to retort the *Charge*, and to raiſe Objections from Antiquity, chiefly, againſt the *Catholick* Cauſe, which I have the Honour to eſpouſe.

My *Answer*, accordingly, if it shall be thought needful to carry it through, must consist of two Parts: One to show that you have not been able to take off what I had charged you with; the Other to make it appear that your Objections against Us are slight and trivial, not capable of doing our Cause Harm.

## *Part the First.*

*Which is to show that you have not been able to take off what I had charged upon you.*

The *Charge* was contained under Two Heads.

1. General Fallacies, running through your whole Book, intituled *Disquisitiones Modestæ.*

2. Particular Defects, *viz.* Misquotations, Misconstructions, Misrepresentations, *&c.*

I do not add the Epithets of *gross*, *egregious*, or the like, as you are pleased to do *(Reply*, p. 100.) because, if I can prove the Facts, the Reader may be left to judge how *gross*, or how *egregious* any *Misconstructions*, *Misrepresentations*, &c. are: and because those and the like Epithets, or Decorations, are then only useful, when a Writer lies under the unhappy Necessity of endeavoring to make up in *Words*, what He wants of *Proof*. But to come directly to the Matter in Hand, I must begin with the Charge of *general* Fallacies, which were Three, and which I shall take in their Order.

1. The first *General Fallacy* charged upon you *, was, your making *Essence* and *Person* to signify the same. One *individual*, or *numerical* Essence you every where interpret to a *Sabellian* Sense; understanding by it one *individual Hypostasis*, or *real* Person. In

* *See my* Defense, p. 399.

your

your *Reply*, you admit *(p. 5.)* that the *ſame numerical intellectual Eſſence* is, with you, equivalent to *ſame Perſon:* So that the *Fact* charg'd upon you ſtands good, by your own Confeſſion.

Now then, let us ſee whether you have dealt fairly and juſtly with Biſhop *Bull.* I obſerved what Influence This one Principle, or *Poſtulatum*, of your's muſt have upon the State of the *general* Queſtion; and indeed upon your whole Thread of Reaſoning quite through your Book. For, if it appears that you have ſet out upon a falſe Ground, you muſt, of Courſe, blunder all the Way, running into a perpetual *Ignoratio Elenchi (*as the Schools call it*)* that is, diſputing beſides the *Queſtion:* which, under pretence and ſhow of Confuting Biſhop *Bull*, is really nothing elſe but confuting an Imagination of your own. The *Queſtion*, with Biſhop *Bull*, was, whether the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers believed the Son to be of an *eternal*, *uncreated*, and ſtrictly *divine* Subſtance. But, with you, it is, whether They believed Him to be the ſame *numerical intellectual Eſſence* (that is, as you interpret it, *Perſon)* with the Father. Thus you have changed the very State of the *general* Queſtion, and muſt, of Courſe, argue all along wide of the Point. So, when you come to particular Authors, you ſtill purſue the ſame Miſtake that you began with. You ſtate the Queſtion relating to *Barnabas (Diſquiſ. Mod.* p. 7.) thus; *Whether* He makes Father and Son *one numerical Eſſence :* which is the ſame, with you, as to ask, whether He makes them the *ſame Perſon.* The Queſtion is ſtated the ſame way, in reſpect of *Hermas* *, *Clemens* of *Rome* †, *Juſtin Martyr* ‡, and Others. With this kind of grave Impertinence you go on confuting Biſhop *Bull*,

* *Diſquiſit. Modeſt.* p. 9.
† *Diſquiſit. Mod.* p. 12.
‡ *Diſquiſit. Mod.* p. 25.

without ſo much as attacking Him; while the main weight and force of your Reaſonings (when They really have any) falls not upon any Thing which He has aſſerted, but upon quite another Thing which you have been pleas'd to invent for Him. It is now Time to hear what you have to ſay in Defenſe of this peculiar Piece of Management. Your *Excuſes* for it are reducible to Three Heads, *1ſt.* That you did not know what Biſhop *Bull* meant. *2dly*, That you had interpreted *numerical Eſſence* as all the Preſent *Orthodox* do, whoſe Cauſe Biſhop *Bull* is ſuppoſed to have eſpouſed. *3dly*, That *numerical Eſſence* does, and muſt ſignify what you pretend, and nothing elſe. Tho' I have not taken your own Words, yet, I think, I have here given your full Senſe; and more diſtinctly and clearly than you have done. I am next to examine your *Excuſes*, one by one.

1. You did not know what Biſhop *Bull* meant, or in what Senſe He maintain'd the *Conſubſtantiality*. So you pretend in your Book *, and repeat it in your *Reply* †, that you are *not certain whether He* (the Biſhop) *pleaded for a* Numerical, or Specifick *Unity of Eſſence*; taking it for granted that every *Numerical* Unity, is ſuch as you have deſcrib'd; and that there is no *Medium* between *Numerical*, in your Senſe, and *Specifick*; that is, no *Medium* between *Sabellianiſm* and *Tritheiſm*. This indeed is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, the prime Falſehood which you ſet out with, and proceed upon; and which makes all your Diſcourſes on this Head confuſed, and wide of the Point. But of This more preſently. As to Biſhop *Bull*, if you had not Sagacity enough to perceive what He meant, you might however *eaſily* and *certainly* have known, that He did *not mean* what

* *Modeſt. Diſquiſ.* p. 31. Præf. † *Reply*, p. 7.

you

you are pleas'd to put upon Him; becauſe He has plainly, frequently, and conſtantly denied *numerical Unity*, in the Senſe of *perſonal Identity*. His Intent was not to prove that the *Fathers* were *Sabellians* (as your way of oppoſing Him every where ſuppoſes,) but that They were not *Arians*. This you could not but know, if you know any thing: And therefore the method and way which you pitch'd upon, of writing againſt his Book, was, to ſay the leaſt of it, very unfair and diſingenuous. You would have your Readers believe that you have confuted the Biſhop, when in reality, after granting you all that you have been able to prove, it is not to the purpoſe, is no *Confutation* of what the Biſhop has aſſerted, but of another *Propoſition* which the Biſhop Himſelf had diſowned, as much as you can do. The Charge therefore of *miſtaking* the Queſtion ſtands good againſt you; and, what is more, *wilful* miſtaking, ſince you could not be ignorant that Biſhop *Bull* did not intend to aſſert *Numerical Unity* in That Senſe wherein you oppoſe it. This is ſufficient for me in Defenſe of my *Charge*. But for the clearer Apprehenſion of Biſhop *Bull*'s meaning in relation to this Matter, I will next cite you ſome of his own Words.

" As concerning the *Specifick* Unity of Perſons, in " the Bleſſed Trinity, ſuch as is the Union of *Sup-* " *poſita*, or *Perſons*, among Things created (for In- " ſtance, of Three Men, *Peter*, *Paul*, and *John*, " which are ſeparate from one another, and do not " any way depend upon each other as to their Eſ- " ſence.) This the Fathers of the firſt Ages never " dream'd of. They acknowledged a very different " Union of the divine Perſons, ſuch as there is no " Pattern of, no Reſemblance perfectly anſwering to " it, whereby to illuſtrate it, among created Beings. " They explain the Matter thus; That God the

" Father

" Father is, as I said, the Head and Fountain of " Divinity, from whom the Son and Holy-Ghoſt " are derived, but ſo derived as not to be divided " from the Father's Perſon, but They are in the " Father, and the Father in Them, by a certain " περιχώρησις or *Inhabitation*, ſo called, as I have " ſhown at large. *Defenſ. Fid. Nic.* Sect. 4. lib. 4. " *Petavius* Himſelf contends that from This περιχώ- " ρησις, *Inhabitation*, a *numerical* Unity may be in- " ferr'd, *Petav.* l. 4. c. 16. It is certainly manifeſt " that this Explication can no way conſiſt with the " *Arian Hypotheſis*: And it is alſo manifeſt that *Tri-* " *theiſm* is excluded by it, and the Unity of the " Godhead made conſiſtent with a *real* Diſtinction " of Perſons.

Thus far Biſhop *Bull*, in his Anſwer to *Gilbert Clarke* *. He ſpeaks much to the ſame purpoſe alſo in his *Defenſe* of the *Nicene Faith* †. " As to *Nu-* " *merical* Unity of Subſtance of Father and Son " (which *Huetius* ſays was denied by *Origen*) I can " make it evident that *Origen* acknowledged That " Unity as far as any of the earlier Fathers, and even " *Athanaſius* Himſelf acknowledged it: That is, " *Origen* believed the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt, " tho' *really* Three Perſons, yet to have no divided " or ſeparate Exiſtence (as Three Men have) but to " be intimately united and conjoyned one with ano- " ther, and to exiſt in each other, and (as I may ſo " ſpeak) to pervade and permeate one another by an " ineffable περιχώρησις, which the Schoolmen call " *Inhabitation*: From which *Inhabitation*, *Petavius* aſ- " ſerts that a *numerical* Unity muſt neceſſarily be " inferr'd.

From this Account of Biſhop *Bull*, it is evident

* Bull. *Poſth. Works*, p. 1004.
† Bull. *Def. Fid. Nic.* p. 130.

that

that He neither admitted *Specifick* Unity, nor *Numerical* in your Senſe: And therefore it was very artificial of you to ſay that you knew not which of the Two He intended, as if He muſt have meant One, when it is ſo plain that He meant Neither, but utterly denied Both. He did indeed aſſert, as you ſee, *Numerical* Unity, but not in your Senſe, not in the *Sabellian* Senſe of *perſonal Identity*.

2. The Second *Excuſe* you make for your impertinent manner of oppoſing Biſhop *Bull* without contradicting Him, is, that you interpreted *Numerical* Eſſence as all the preſent *Orthodox* do, whoſe Cauſe Biſhop *Bull* is ſuppoſed to eſpouſe. So you tell us in the *Preface* to *Modeſt Diſquiſitions* *, that you diſpute againſt the *Conſubſtantiality*, in no other than the *Numerical* Senſe, as aſſerted by *all the Orthodox*. Now, ſuppoſing it were certainly true (as it is certainly falſe) that all, who at preſent paſs for *Orthodox*, underſtood *Numerical Eſſence* in the ſame Senſe as you oppoſe it in; yet would it not be fair towards Biſhop *Bull*, to put That Senſe upon Him which He ſo fully, and ſo conſtantly diſowns and diſclaims. All that you ſhould have done, in this Caſe, ſhould have been to have obſerv'd, that Biſhop *Bull*'s Book is nothing to the purpoſe of the preſent *Orthodox*, who are all *Sabellians*, in as much as He has only ſhown that the Fathers were not *Arians*, has not proved that they were *Sabellians*. And you might have took notice, on this occaſion, how weak and inconſiſtent all the *Orthodox* are, in receiving and applauding Biſhop *Bull*'s Book, a Book which has proved nothing which can ſerve their purpoſe; a Book which is ſo far from aſſerting *Sabellianiſm*, that is, *Orthodoxy* (as it is called) that it rather ſtands in direct Oppoſition to it. Now this would have been the fair open way, as well towards the preſent

* Whitby, *Diſqu. Mod.* p. 32. *Præf. Reply*, p. 4.

*Ortho-*

*Orthodox*, as towards Biſhop *Bull*. Towards the *Latter*, becauſe it is a certain Truth that He has by no means ſerved the Cauſe of *Sabellianiſm*, or of *Numerical* Unity, in your Senſe: Towards the *Former*, becauſe it might have given Them an opportunity of explaining Themſelves upon this Head; And They might take their Choice, either to give up Biſhop *Bull* and all the *Fathers* at once, or elſe (which is moſt likely) declare what you ſay of them to be pure Calumny and Defamation. For my part, I make no doubt but it is a Slander upon them; and that you will be found at length to underſtand as little of the *Moderns*, as you do of the *Antients*. I have good Reaſon for what I ſay, from one particular Inſtance which I meet with in your Reply, *p.* 102. I am there repreſented, as having *departed from the general received Doctrine of the Church, from the Fourth Century to this preſent Age*, for no other reaſon but for ſaying, I mean *a real Perſon and no Mode*. Is it then really ſo, that All the *Orthodox*, from the fourth Century down to the preſent, have believed a *Perſon* to be a *Mode*, that is, in plain *Engliſh*, a *Manner*; and three Perſons to be *three Manners?* Believe it that can: I have a much better Opinion, nay, certain Knowledge of them. The *Catholicks*, indeed, down from the fourth (I may ſay from the firſt) Century, have believed that there is no Diſparity of Nature, no Diviſion of Subſtance, no Difference in any Perfection between Father and Son; but that They are equally Wiſe, equally Infinite, equally Perfect in all Reſpects; differing only in this, that one is a Father, and the other a Son, one *Unbegotten*, and the other *Begotten*, as a Third is *proceeding:* And theſe three different *Manners*, or *Modes*, of Exiſtence diſtinguiſh the Perſons one from another, perfectly alike and equal in all other reſpects. The Phraſe therefore of *Modes of Exiſting*,

*Existing*, was not design'd to denote the *Persons* Themselves, but their *distinguishing Characters*. This is what Dr. *South*'s Authorities sufficiently prove, and all that They prove; and, I presume, all that He meant. For, tho' you are pleased to quote Him against Me, He is expressly for Me, where He utterly denies * *that the Three divine Persons are only Three Modes of the Deity*. However that be, I take my Accounts of the *Antients* from the *Antients* themselves. If you can find any one, I do not say of the fourth, but even of the sixth, or eighth Century, to go no lower, laying it down for *Catholick* Doctrine that a *Person* is a *Mode*, it will be kind to oblige us with the Discovery. As to the *Antients*, I will be bound to answer for Them, that what you say of them from the fourth Century, is pure Invention and Romance: And as to *Moderns*, I am very Inclinable to hope, I make no Scruple to believe, that you have misreported Them as much as you have done the other.

3. Your third and last *Excuse* is, that *Numerical Essence* does and must signify what you pretend, and nothing else: And therefore it was right to fix it upon Bishop *Bull*, who must be supposed to maintain *Numerical* Unity. This is your meaning (*Reply*, p. 4.) tho' you seldom take care to express your self clearly and distinctly. To this I answer first, that admitting that your Sense of *Numerical Unity*, is the only true and proper Sense of it: Yet does it not follow, that you have any right to fix your Sense upon Bishop *Bull* in Contradiction to his declared Sentiments. If any Man has a mind to use Words in an *improper* Sense, provided He gives but sufficient Notice of it, He should not be rigorously dealt with for it, or have a Sense imposed upon Him which He utterly disclaims. A fair and candid Ad-

* South. *Animadv.* c. 8. p. 290, 291.

 versary,

verſary, in ſuch a Caſe, ſhould make Allowance for *Words*, and attend to the *Thing*. To make the beſt of it, it is very unkind and unfair, induſtriouſly to miſtake an Author's meaning, in ſuch a Caſe, and to go about to confute what He certainly never intended to maintain; nay, what He is known to have denied and diſclaimed. But to come a little cloſer to the Point; How do you prove, after all, that your's is the only proper Senſe of *Numerical*? What if you ſhould fail here, in the main Point of all, wherein your great Confidence lies, and for the ſake of which you have rais'd all this Duſt upon Biſhop *Bull*, and thrown Scandal at large both upon Antients and Moderns? It is very certain, that *Numerical*, or *Individual* Unity has been, and is, maintain'd by *Catholicks*, and *Catholicks* that abhorred *Sabellianiſm*. Could you prove that your Senſe of *Numerical Eſſence* is the only *proper* Senſe, yet you can never prove that it is the *only* Senſe it has been uſed in: So that, at length, the Diſpute about it would be nothing more than a Diſpute about Words.

But I will give you a plain Reaſon why you can never prove your Senſe of the Words to be the only *proper* Senſe: It is becauſe you can never fix any *certain Principle of Individuation*. It is for want of This, that you can never aſſure me, that three *real* Perſons, may not be, or are not, one *Numerical*, or *Individual* Subſtance. In ſhort, you know not, preciſely, what it is that makes *one Being*, or *one Eſſence*, or *one Subſtance*. Here your *Metaphyſicks* are plainly defective; and This it is that renders all your Speculations upon that Head, vain and fruitleſs. Tell me plainly, is the *divine Subſtance* preſent in every place, in *Whole*, or in *Part*? Is the *Subſtance* which is preſent here upon Earth, that very *Individual Numerical* Subſtance which is preſent in Heaven, or is it not? Your anſwer to theſe Queſtions

may

may perhaps ſuggeſt ſomething to you, which may help you out of your Difficulties relating to the *Trinity*; or elſe the Senſe of your inability to anſwer Either, may teach you to be leſs confident in Matters ſo much above you, and to confeſs your Ignorance in Things of this Nature, as I freely do mine.

You tell us very ſolemnly *(p. 4.)* repeating it ſeveral Times, that the ſame *Numerical Eſſence* neither doth nor can ſignify any more than one *Eſſence* in *Number*. Which is only telling us, that the ſame *Numerical Eſſence* is the ſame *Numerical Eſſence*, Aye that it is: And who doubts it? Or who is the wiſer for theſe weighty Diſcoveries? How ſhall I ever know, from thence, that three real Perſons may not be, or are not one *Numerical* Subſtance, one Being, one God? You will *ſuppoſe*, without doubt, that one *Intellectual Eſſence*, or *one Perſon*, are equivalent and *reciprocal*. And I, on the other hand, will *ſuppoſe* the contrary, and then we are juſt as we began. You have not proved, nor ever can prove that three real Perſons may not be properly called *one numerical* Subſtance. If you have all along gone upon the Suppoſition that They cannot, you have ſhown that you can miſtake, that you can beg the Queſtion, that you can wander from the Point in Hand, can trifle much and prove little, and That is all.

The Sum then of what I have pleaded to make good my *Charge* of the firſt *general Fallacy*, is, that you have ſet out wrong, miſtook the very Point in Queſtion, purſued your Miſtake all along, and followed your own Wandrings, inſtead of oppoſing Biſhop *Bull*: That you have no *excuſe* for underſtanding *numerical* Eſſence as you do, either from Biſhop *Bull*'s Book, who never ſo underſtands it, or from the *Catholick* Senſe of it, Antient or Modern, which is different from your's, or from the *Propriety* of the Phraſe it ſelf, which may, for any

thing you know, admit of another Senſe, and which you have no way of confuting but by *begging the Queſtion;* which is not *confuting,* but rather tacitely acknowledging that it is not capable of any Confutation. So much for the firſt Article: Only here I muſt be ſo juſt to you as to obſerve, that you do not always wander from the Point in Queſtion. You do ſometimes, indeed often, attempt to prove that the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers were of Thoſe Principles which were afterwards called *Arian.* So far is pertinent, and is directly oppoſing Biſhop *Bull.* But then I muſt obſerve farther, that leſt you ſhould happen, at length, to fail in your firſt point of proving the *Fathers* to have been *Arians,* you reſerve the other point as what you can prove and can never fail of, namely, that They were not *Sabellians:* And This is what the Reſult of your Arguments generally comes to, after you have carried Them on as far as They can go. The firſt Point is what you ſeem moſt deſirous of proving, were it poſſible to do it: But if you cannot do That, you are content however to prove the Latter, rather than ſeem to have done nothing. I ſhould here conclude this Article, but that two or three incidental Things ſhould be taken notice of, which muſt come in here, or no where. I had obſerved * ſeveral *Guards* which you had put in, in the general State of the Queſtion, as it were with deſign to ſecure a handſom Retreat. You ſay, *all* the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers; when the *moſt,* or the *generality* might be ſufficient. I had reaſon

* Defenſe, *p.* 401. *The general Queſtion is thus ſtated.*

*Whether* All *the* Ante-Nicene *Fathers profeſs'd the very ſame Doctrine which* We aſcribe *to the* Nicene *Council; that is, whether all acknowledged the ſame* Numerical *Eſſence of the Father to have been* communicated *to the Son and Holy-Ghoſt, and that therefore both are one God in* Number *with the Father.* Whitby. Proem. *p.* 2.

to

to obſerve this, becauſe Biſhop *Bull*, had, in a manner, given up *Lactantius:* Beſides, that it is not neceſſary to aſſert that every Writer (ſuppoſe *Clemens* of *Rome*, or *Barnabas)* has ſaid enough in a ſhort Epiſtle, from whence it might certainly be inferr'd that their Principles were the ſame with thoſe of the *Nicene Fathers*. It is ſufficient if as many as ſpeak plainly either way, are on our Side; and that none of the *earlier* Writers contradict it, but are in the main favourable to us, and *probably*, if not *demonſtrably* ours. Another *Guard* inſerted was, *which we aſcribe* to the *Nicene* Council, inſtead of, *which was aſſerted by the* Nicene *Council*. The reaſon I had to take notice of This, is apparent from what hath been ſaid. *Numerical* Eſſence, rather than *ſame Eſſence*, was another *Guard:* And what uſe you make of it is viſible enough. That this Eſſence, the ſame *Numerical* Eſſence (or *Perſon* as you underſtand it) was *communicated* to two other Perſons, is what you demand to have proved: And you have ſome pretence for Cavil at the word *communicated*. This I obſerved before: And your *Reply* * is, that what I *call a Pretence to quarrel at the Word* Communicated, *is indeed* Arguments *produced againſt it, as it is ſtated by the* Biſhop, *and which* I *durſt not meddle with nor pretend to anſwer*. The Reaſon of my not anſwering your Cavils againſt the Expreſſion, was becauſe it was foreign to my purpoſe, and becauſe we were inquiring, whether Biſhop *Bull* had truly and juſtly repreſented the *Antients*, not whether His Doctrine (the ſame with the antient Doctrine) is liable to the Charge of Contradiction. If you are able to prove any thing of that kind (as you are not) againſt Biſhop *Bull*, it will hold equally againſt the *Antients*, and Him too; and is of diſtinct Conſideration from the Point which we are now upon. However, if our Readers

* Reply, *p.* 5.

will

will pardon a ſmall Digreſſion, I ſhall here examine thoſe weighty *Arguments*, which before, it ſeems, *I durſt not meddle with.*

You object (*Praf. p.* 21.) *that the* Communication *of the Father's* Eſſence *to a* Perſon *is inconceivable, becauſe the* Perſon *muſt be ſuppoſed to have it, to be a* Perſon. This is nothing but Cavilling at a popular way of Expreſſion. In ſtrictneſs of Speech, the Perſon of the Son is the very Thing which is derived, communicated, generated; and the Father, in communicating his Eſſence, generates the Perſon of the Son.

You object farther; *That if the ſame* numerical *Eſſence of the* Father *be* communicated, *then it is the ſame* numerical *Eſſence in Both, only exiſting in a different* Manner. To which I anſwer, if you mean by *numerical Eſſence*, the ſame *numerical Perſon*, it is not *communicated* at all: For the *Perſon* of the Father only *communicates*, the Perſon of the Son is *communicated*: And Theſe two *Perſons*, or *Hypoſtaſes* conſtitute the ſame *numerical* Eſſence; which conſequently, as perſonalized in the Son, is *begotten*, as perſonalized in the Father, *unbegotten*, that is, exiſts in a different Manner. The two Perſons exiſt after a different Manner; which two Perſons conſtitute one *numerical* Eſſence; and therefore I admit that the ſame *numerical* Eſſence does exiſt in a different Manner, in the two Perſons.

You object alſo *, that *the Eſſence of the Father is unbegotten, the Eſſence of the Son begotten, therefore Both cannot be the ſame Eſſence.* That Both cannot be the ſame *Hypoſtaſis*, or *Perſon*, is very certain, for the reaſon which you give. But that two *Hypoſtaſes*, one unbegotten, the other begotten, may not conſtitute one Subſtance, or Eſſence, you have not ſhown. All theſe Objections of your's turn only upon your

* *Praf.* p. 21.

miſtaken

mistaken Sense of *numerical* Essence, and amount to no more than a *Petitio principii*; while you take for granted the Thing in Question, that there cannot be two real Persons in one *Substance*, or *Essence*. I can tell you of Some, whose Judgment you much rely on, who must, upon their Principles, allow, that the same *numerical* Substance; is both greater and less than the same *numerical* Substance; is remote and distant from the same *numerical* Substance, is contained in, and contains the same *numerical* Substance (see my *Defense* p. 299.) They must likewise admit of *Being* and *Being*, in the same *numerical* Being; *Substance* and *Substance*, in the same *numerical* Substance: as also *Being* and *Being*, where they cannot say *Beings*, in the plural; *Substance* and *Substance*, where they cannot say *Substances*; *Essence* and *Essence*, where they cannot say *Essences*. (See my *Defense*, p. 167, 168.) These Things, perhaps, may appear new and strange to you: But if you please to consider them, They may be useful to convince you of your fundamental mistake in confining the Phrase of *numerical Substance* to one particular Sense of your own; and may help to satisfy you that there's nothing absurd or contradictory in the Supposition, that one and the same *numerical Substance* may be both *begotten* and *unbegotten*. You may also please to consider that tho' the *Catholicks* (especially after They came to express Themselves accurately) would never, or very seldom, say *two Substances*, *two Essences*, *two Spirits*, *two Lights*, *two Wisdoms*, or *two Wills*, any more than *two Gods*, or *two Lords*; yet They never scrupled to say *Substance of Substance*, *Essence of Essence*, *Spirit of Spirit*, *Light of Light*, *Wisdom of Wisdom*, *Will of Will*, in like manner, as *God of God*. All which is to intimate that the Union is not *Numerical*, in the *Sabellian*, that is, in your Sense: And yet it is *Numerical* in another; insomuch that you cannot here speak of *Substances*,

or

or *Essences*, in the plural, as you may of Things *specifically* united, and no more.

You object farther *, *that the same Substance cannot be subordinate to none in the Father, and yet subordinate in the Son or Holy-Ghost.* Yes, it may, if three Persons can be one and the *same Substance*, because these Persons may be *subordinate* one to another. Here, again, you suppose that three Persons cannot be one Substance. And now, is not This shrewd arguing, thus perpetually to beg the Question? You have one *Turn of Wit* more, and it is against *interior Production*, which you pretend is such a *solid Argument* as I *had the Wit to leave unanswered*, (*Reply*, p. 6.) This *interior Production*, you say †, is *either the Production of something or nothing.* Wonderful *solid!* Well, what if it be the Production of *something?* For undoubtedly we do not mean it of a Production of nothing, that is, of no Production. Then you say it must be the Production of something *new*, for a Production is always of something *new*. *Solid* again! that an *eternal* Production must be a Production of something *new*. But you cannot conceive, it may be, *how* any *Production* should be *eternal*. And what if you cannot conceive *how* any thing should be *eternal?* I expect a proof of you that it cannot be. Your *Supposing* it cannot, will give me no Satisfaction. I have now run through your little Quirks and Subtilties upon this Head, which yet are not *yours*, but as old almost as the Controversy; despised by Men of Sense all-along, despised even by your self, thirty Years ago; when, with Honour to your self, and to the Satisfaction and Benefit of others, you wrote in Defense of That Antient Faith, which now you revile and blaspheme.

* *Disquisit. Mod.* p. 23. Præf.
† *Disquisit. Mod.* p. 23. Præf.

But

But to conclude this Article, tho' I have, in Civility towards you, considered your Arguments drawn from the *Nature* and *Reason* of the Thing, yet I must repeat my Observation, that we may have nothing to do with them, in our present Enquiry relating to the *Antients*; because if They are of any weight, They are as much against the Faith of the *Antients* Themselves, as against Bishop *Bull*, who acknowledges no other *Numerical* Unity than the Antients acknowledged. Having made good my first *Charge*, I proceed to a Second.

II. A second *general Fallacy* *, was your arguing from the Expressions of *Arians* (famous for dissembling and equivocating) to Those of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers; Men of a very different Stamp and Character, and who were not under the like Temptation of saying one Thing and meaning another. I had observed that you had recourse to this *Salvo*, or *Fallacy*, in order to elude the Force of some *High Expressions*, (in respect of the Son's Divinity) which you met with in the *Ante-Nicene* Writers. To this you reply, (*p.* 9.)

1. That it *is not fairly suggested, that you do This when you* find some Expressions run pretty high and strong for the Divinity of Christ: *For, in all the Places referr'd to, there is no Expression of that Nature but in the last.* If you please to look back to your *Prooemium*, (p. 4, 5.) you will there find that you have made use of the *Fallacy* which I charge you with, as a general Answer to invalidate the Force of most, or all Bishop *Bull*'s Testimonies. You observe that the acknowledging of Christ to be *God of God*, or *God before the Worlds* was common to many who were utter Enemies to the *Nicene* Faith. You go on to prove This farther by the Author of the *Opus Im-*

* *See my* Defense, *p.* 403, 404.



*perfectum*,

*perfectum*, which Author you pronounce an *Arian*. You proceed to observe from Bishop *Bull* Himself, that the *Arians* scrupled not any of the *Catholick* Forms of Speech, save only the Term *Consubstantial*. They would say, for Instance, that the Son was *begotten out of the Father Himself*, and was *true God*; and They rejected with Indignation the Charge of making the Son a *Creature*. Now, what could be your meaning in these Remarks, but to insinuate to your Reader, that let Him meet with ever so *High Expressions* of the Son's *Divinity* among the *Ante-Nicene* Writers; yet unless They have the very word *Consubstantial*, They might possibly, or probably, mean no more than the *Arians* did after by the same or the like Expressions? This is the *Fallacy* which I complain'd of, and which you often occasionally recur to, both in your Book and Prefaces, to weaken the Force of Bishop *Bull*'s Authorities. Some of the Places where you do This, I referr'd to *, in my *Defense*, which the Reader that has a mind to it may turn to; and I do not yet see that I have *suggested* any thing but what is both fair and true.

2. A second Evasion you have in your *Reply*, (p. 5.) is that you said sometimes *Arians* and *Semi-arians*, whereas I have represented you as if you had said *Arians* only. I do not see that This is at all Material. If either *Arians* or *Semi-arians* used *Catholick* Expressions without a *Catholick* Meaning, They come so far under the same Predicament of *dissembling*, and *equivocating*: And that Both were notoriously guilty of so doing, is clear from all History of those Times. The *Semi-arians* in particular were often charged with it, both by *Catholicks* and *Anomœans*. You say, farther, that you likewise join mostly with them some of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers. But you will never be able to show that those *Ante-*

* *Prof.* p. 4 29. *Disqu. Mod.* p. 8, 9, 40. 90. 109. 153. 157.

*Nicene*

*Nicene* Fathers were of different Principles from the *Council* of *Nice:* So that your joining Them with the others was either foreign to the Point, or supposing the very Thing in Question.

3. You reply thirdly *(p.* 10.*)* that *sure it must be a very uncharitable Censure to pronounce of near a Thousand Bishops convened at* Antioch, Seleucia, Sirmium, Ariminum *and elsewhere, that They were a pack of* Hypocrites, *and* equivocating Knaves. To which I make answer, first, that I know not how you will be able to make out near your Number. If you add the Numbers of the several Councils, you may probably reckon many of the same Men twice or thrice over. Neither were the Men that made up those *Councils*, all of them *Arians*. There were but 80 of the whole 400 at *Ariminum*, really *Arians*. So that probably 320 were imposed upon by the rest, and the Charge of *equivocating* lies upon the 80 only. And it is evident not only from *Athanasius*, but also from *Sulpicius Severus*, and St. *Jerom*, and indeed from all the Historians, and all the Accounts we have of that Council, that the *Arians* at *Ariminum* carried their Point by *Equivocation* and *Wile*, and that the *Catholicks*, most of them, were imposed upon by *double Entendres*. They went upon those *charitable* Principles which you are pleas'd to recommend. They could not imagine there was so much latent Insincerity and Guile, under so many fine Words and fair Pretences from Men of their own Order.

2. I answer secondly, that there may be some difference between charging Men with *Equivocation*, and calling Them *Knaves*. There is a Reverend Doctor, whom I scruple not to Charge with *Equivocating*. He says, in a Preface *, He has many

* Ut verum fatear, multa sunt quæ me impediunt quo minus a sententia de *Vera Christi Deitate* recederem, id solum contendo *&c.* Whitby. *Disqu. Mod.* p. 3. Præf.

Things which hinder Him from receding from the Belief of Christ's *true Divinity:* And it is well known what He once meant by Christ's *true Divinity*, when He wrote a *Tract* * with that Title, in Defense of it. Who would not charitably believe, from hence, that He still retain'd the same Faith, in the same *true Divinity*? But see what He means by Christ's *true Divinity* (*Disqu. Mod.* p. 25. †) where He commends *Justin Martyr* for maintaining Christ's *true Divinity*, making This an Argument of it, that *Justin*'s Sentiments were clearly opposite to the Doctrine of the *Nicene Council*. Hence it is manifest, that the Doctor *equivocates* in the Phrase *true Divinity*. The *Fact* I maintain; but if from thence you'l infer that He is an *equivocating Knave*, remember that the *Inference* is your's, and not mine.

4. You reply fourthly, as from *Sozomen*, *that when the* Arians *first appeared*, *many* Bishops, *a considerable Number of the Clergy*, *and no small Part of the People*—*favoured his Party*; *and that two Synods convened at* Bithynia, *and* Palestine, *wrote to their Brethren to communicate with those* Arians, *as being* Orthodox. And here you ask, *were all those Holy Men and able Judges*, *those* Synods, Bishops, Clerks, *and Laity*, *a pack of* Hypocritical *Dissemblers*, *and equivocating* Knaves? No; I charitably believe otherwise. The *Synods*, *Bishops*, *Clerks*, and Laity, who received the *Arians* as *Orthodox*, were not, probably, the *equivocating Knaves* (as you chuse to express it) but the *Arians*; who by fair Words, and artful *Confessions*, *appeared*

* Whitby, de vera Christi Deitate: *Tractatus*, *Ann.* 1691.

† Magnam admirationem mihi injecit iniqua eorum sententia, qui *Justinum* M. Christianæ Fidei Simplicitatem, in Doctrina de Christi præ-existentia, *Veraque Deitate*, adulterasse suspicati sunt; quo Patrum Nemo, (leg. *Neminem*) meo quidem judicio, vel *plura* vel *clariora adversus Synodi* Nicænæ *placita* docuisse, facile est Demonstrare. Whitby. *Disqu. Mod.* p. 25.

to

to be what They were not, and so were received as *Orthodox*. You will remember that the Principal of those *Holy Men*, and *able Judges*, that promoted *Arius*'s Interest in the Synod of *Bithynia*, was *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*: The same Man that afterwards profess'd * his Assent and Consent to the *Nicene* Creed, as the true *Catholick* Faith; and excused his not consenting to the *Anathematizing* of *Arius*, upon this Foot, that He thought *Arius* had been much misrepresented, and that He knew from *Arius*'s own Letters, that He was not the Man that the *Council* took Him to be. Now if *Eusebius*, the principal Man of the Synod of *Bithynia*, was thus imposed upon by *Arius*'s fair Pretences, no doubt but He represented *Arius*'s Case to the Synod, as favourably as He Himself had conceiv'd of it: And then no wonder if a Man was receiv'd as *Orthodox*, who was really believ'd to be *Orthodox*. If you think that *Eusebius*, all the while, knew that *Arius* was not *Orthodox*, in my Sense of the Word; Admitting That, yet He might, for any Thing I know, represent Him as such Then, as well as He did After: If so, the only *equivocating Knave* might be *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*; the rest might be imposed upon by his Representations and Colourings. *Holy Men* and *able Judges* can Judge no otherwise of Facts, but as They are reported: And how could it be remedied, if *Arius* happen'd to get good Testimonials, tho' Himself an Ill-Man? But enough of this Matter: As to the *Arian* Custom of *equivocating*, and thereby imposing upon Honest Men, The Fact being plain, I shall insist no longer upon it, only referring to a few Authors † who give a summary Account of it.

* Sozom. E. H. l. 2. c. 16. p. 378.

† Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 293. Cave's *Life of* Athanasius. Cave. Epist. Apolog. p. 96. Clerc. Epist. Crit. 2. p. 52.

III. A Third *general Fallacy*, juſt hinted in my *Defenſe*, (p. 405.) was, your arguing againſt the Faith of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, in reſpect of Chriſt's real Divinity, from this Topic; that They often diſtinguiſh *God* from *Chriſt*, and call the Father *God* abſolutely.

Here, again, you complain of Me for *unfair Dealing*. But how, or wherein am I *unfair* towards You? You ſay (*Reply*, p. 11.) *that your firſt Inſtance of this Nature is from the Epiſtle of* Clemens Romanus, *where He conſtantly ſeparates* (diſtinguiſhes, you mean) Jeſus Chriſt *from That God, whom He ſtiles the true and only God, but never once calls Him God.* If this Anſwer be any thing pertinent, I ſuppoſe your meaning is, that your Argument did not turn upon This, that *Chriſt* was diſtinguiſh'd from *God*; but upon theſe farther Conſiderations, that *Chriſt* is *conſtantly* ſo diſtinguiſh'd by *Clemens*, and never once called *God*. You may, if you pleaſe, call all thoſe Conſiderations put together, one Argument: But They appeared to me to be diſtinct and ſeveral. You obſerve * of *Clemens*, that *He perpetually diſtinguiſhes Chriſt from God (Chriſtum a Deo perpetuo diſtinguit.)* This was one Conſideration, or Preſumption in favour of your Principles. A ſecond you add immediately after, *Deum vero ne ſemel nuncupat*, *But He never calls Chriſt God.* You proceed to illuſtrate your firſt Obſervation by ſuch Inſtances as Theſe following; That *Clemens* wiſhes Grace and Peace to the *Corinthians* from *Almighty God*, by *Jeſus Chriſt*; That He introduces (Ch. 20*th*.) the *great Creator* and *Lord of the Univerſe* diſtributing his Bleſſings by *Jeſus Chriſt*; That *Chriſt* was ſent of *God*, Ch. 42; and that the Apoſtles had their Commiſſion by Chriſt from *God*, Ch. 43. Now to what purpoſe were theſe ſeveral Inſtances produced, except you intended them as ſo

* *Diſqu. Mod.* p. 16.

many

many Arguments againſt *Clemens* his believing Chriſt to be Conſubſtantial with Him whom alone He calls *God*, and from whom He diſtinguiſhes *Chriſt?* But I inſiſt upon it, that there is no weight at all in this Argument. Nothing has been more common with Writers, who have fully believed the Doctrine of a Co-eternal Trinity, than this Manner of ſpeaking; eſpecially when They have been thinking on another Subject, and had no occaſion to ſpeak of *Chriſt*'s Divinity. And what if *Clemens*, or *Polycarp*, or any other Writer, in a ſhort Epiſtle, or Tract, has ſpoke of the Father only, under the Title of *God*, and of the Son as *Lord*, or *Saviour*, or *High-Prieſt*? How often might the ſame Thing be obſerved in modern Treatiſes, or Sermons of very Orthodox Men? I ſee no Conſequence that can be juſtly drawn againſt our Principles, from theſe Premiſes. And if *Clemens* called the Father the *only God*, or only *true God*, tho' That be a diſtinct Argument from the former; yet neither does it prove any thing more than the other, as I have ſhown in another Place *.

But you refer me to ſome *Collections* of your's, in another Book †, from *Origen*; who, it ſeems, in his Book againſt *Celſus*, *diſtinguiſhes* and *ſeparates* (ſo you ſay *p.* 12.) *Chriſt* from Him who is *God above all*; and declares, in the Name of the generality of Chriſtians, that *Chriſt* is not *the God above all*. This is not pertinent to the Point in Hand, having no Relation to the *Fallacy* I charg'd you with, nor belonging to the Book which I was animadverting upon. But that I may not ſtand upon Niceties with you, I will give you an Anſwer to this *new* Pretence. It is very certain that *Origen* never intended to deny that *Chriſt* is *God above all:* Becauſe all *Catholicks* ‡ (I might ſay *Here-*

* *Sermon* 4th.

† Præf. de S. Script. Interpr. *p.* 34, 35.

‡ *See the Teſtimonies in* Mills. *And my* Sermons p. 221.

*ticks*

*ticks* too for the moſt part) both before and after *Origen*'s Time, as well as *Origen* Himſelf, underſtood *Rom.* 9. 5. of God the Son, there ſtiled ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς, or *God above all.* Yet there is a certain Senſe in which the Antients have denied Chriſt to be the *God above all*; namely, when ſo underſtood as to make Chriſt the very *Perſon of the Father*, as the *Sabellians* underſtood it *, or to ſet Him *above the Father* †, or *above the Creator* ‡ of the World, as ſome other *Hereticks* pretended. In this latter Senſe it is that *Origen* denies the Son to be *God above all*; as He had reaſon to do, becauſe it would have been denying His *Subordination* and *Sonſhip*, and inverting the Order of the Perſons, to have aſſerted that *Chriſt* was in any Senſe *above the Father*, or ſo *God above all*, as to have the *Creator*, or *Father*, ſubordinate to Him.

Notwithſtanding all This, *Origen* Himſelf, in the very Page before That which you refer to, aſſerts and maintains the *Catholick* Doctrine in full and expreſs Terms, the very ſame Doctrine that we contend for at this Day. For, having objected to *Celſus* ** the worſhip of *many Gods*, telling Him that if He would be conſiſtent with his Principles, He ſhould not talk of the Kingdom of *God*, in the Singular, but of *Gods*, in the Plural, He then bethinks Himſelf that the Argument might be retorted upon Chriſtians, as worſhipping two Gods, *viz.* the *Father* and *Chriſt*. Here was the Critical Place; Here, if any where, we ſhall ſee of what Principles *Origen* was. Well, How does *Origen* get rid of the Ob-

* Vid. Apoſt. Conſtit. l. 6. c. 26. Pſeud Ignat. Ep. ad Tarſ. c. 5. Ad Philip. c. 7.

† Origen Contr. Celſ. p. 387. Baſil. Epiſt. 78. p. 892.

‡ Vid. Iren. p. 101. 106. Edit. Bened. Origen in Matt. p. 476. Huet.

** Vid. Origen. p. 385, 386.

jection?

jection? Not by saying that the Father *only* is God, in a *proper* Sense: Not by saying that the Father is *Supreme God*, and the Son *another* God under Him. No, He was wiser than to make Himself ridiculous to *Jew* and *Gentile*, by such a weak Answer: But He solves the Difficulty by asserting the *Unity* of Father and Son: And, after He had guarded his Assertion from any *Sabellian* Construction, He triumphantly closes up all in these Words; *We therefore, as I have shown, worship one God, the Father and Son* *. Thus He at once cleared the Christian Doctrine from *Polytheism*, and made good the Charge against the *Pagans*.

From what hath been said it may appear, that *Origen* has denied no more than all *Catholicks* deny, namely, that *the Father is subordinate to the Son:* And has asserted as much as any *Catholick* contends for. We do not say that *Christ* is That Person who is ordinarily, and eminently stiled *God above all*, nor that He is in any Sense, or Respect, *above* the *Creator*, or above *God* the *Father*, being subordinate to Him; But we assert that He is essentially one God with Him who is the *Father*, and, as such, is *God above all:* And this very Doctrine is plainly *Origen's*, as well as Ours. You have forced Me into this Digression, by making your Objection in a wrong Place; and therefore let That be my Excuse to the Reader for it. Now I return.

I have run through the Three *general Fallacies* which I charged you with. Your feeble Endeavors to take Them off, prove ineffectual: And They now return upon you with the greater Force.

I am next to consider the *particular Defects*. But, before I proceed farther, it will here be proper to remove a Complaint of yours, which you repeat

* Ἕνα ἄρα θεὸν, ὡς ἀποδέδωκαμεν, τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν σεβόμενοι. pag. 386.

more than once: It is a Complaint of my Management, and Conduct relating to your Book.

You tell me (*p.* 2.) that I *have not defended any of the Bishop's Arguments, which you had produced and answer'd; nor made any reply to those numerous Arguments, which you produced from the* Ante-Nicene *Fathers against Mine and the Bishop's Sentiments.*— In another Place, you say thus, (*p.* 57.) *He is obliged, if He would indeed defend the Bishop, to invalidate and refute the Answers that I have given to all his Arguments, and to do this entirely, and not by Culling out two or three Instances, and leaving all the rest in their full strength; That being in all the other Cases, to leave the Bishop in the Lurch.*

By all This, you seem to think, that Bishop *Bull*'s celebrated Performance is in some Danger of sinking in its Character, if your *Modest Disquisitions* be not particularly answer'd, Paragraph by Paragraph; and that I ought to have paid so much Respect to your *Work*, as either not to have meddled at all with it, or to have attended you all the way through it. Now, as to this Matter, I will here frankly declare to you my real Thoughts, in the following Particulars.

1. In the first Place, I am so far from apprehending any Danger to Bishop *Bull*, and his Cause, from your Book, that I should never have given my self the trouble of remarking at all upon it, had it not been given out to *English* Readers (who must take such Things on Trust) that Bishop *Bull*'s famed Piece would receive an Answer, such as should satisfy *All learned and unprejudiced Persons.* I knew that a *Latin* Book could do no Harm, but among Those that could read *Latin*; and such I thought might, for the most part, be very safely trusted, having Bishop *Bull*'s Book to compare with your's, which alone is sufficient to answer for it self, with Men of any Judgment. The

Danger

Danger was not from the *Book* it ſelf, but from the *Reports* made of it: And it concern'd me to take care that *Engliſh* Readers might not be impoſed upon; which was one principal Motive of my doing what I did.

2. I conſidered farther, that this Controverſy being of all others the moſt nice and intricate, and in which it is the eaſieſt for a Writer, that has a mind to it, to confound and puzzle ſuch Readers as have not been converſant in it; I ſay, I conſidered that it might be uſeful even to ſome *Latin Readers* to point out the principal Flaws and Fallacies in your Performance, which when done, your whole Book is in a manner anſwer'd; or however anſwer'd as far as is needful, to prevent any honeſt Man's being impoſed upon by it.

3*dly*, You will give me leave to tell you, with all due Reſpect (however frankly) that a Writer who begins, and proceeds as you do, has no reaſon to expect an Anſwer Paragraph by Paragraph; becauſe there is a ſhorter, and much better way of dealing with Authors that are not careful to write *pertinently*. Who, do you imagine, would be at the Trouble of telling you a hundred Times over, that this Argument is good againſt the *Sabellians*, and in ſuch a Senſe of *numerical Eſſence* as is not to the purpoſe; but in Biſhop *Bull*'s Senſe, and in the true Senſe, the Argument is of no weight at all? One ſhort general Anſwer is ſufficient in ſuch a Caſe; and is in reality as long as the Objection, which is only Repetition of the ſame Thing. Had you ſtated the *Queſtion* fairly, kept cloſe to the Point in Hand, arguing *pertinently* at leaſt, if not *ſolidly*, all along, directly oppoſing That, and That only, which Biſhop *Bull* undertook to prove; then indeed it might have concern'd us to attend upon you all the way through; and to have defended the Biſhop againſt your Attacks.

But when, inſtead of this, you ſet out upon a wrong Foot, and wander wide and far from the Mark you ſhould have aimed at: When inſtead of attacking Biſhop *Bull* directly, you encounter for the moſt part a Phantom of your own, and Fight with your Shadow: In ſuch a Caſe as this, we have no need to be ſolicitous about the Biſhop. Thoſe formidable Preparations, which might be otherwiſe apt to ſtrike Terror into us, are happily diverted another way: All we have now left to do, is to ſtand by unconcern'd, look on, and ſmile. Theſe are my Reaſons why I hold my ſelf excuſed from making any more particular Anſwer to your *numerous Arguments*, as you are pleaſed to call Them. You may give Us leave to judge how far our Cauſe may be endanger'd by what you have done: And if We who are Friends to the Biſhop and his Cauſe, are in no pain about Either, nor at all afraid of *leaving Them in the Lurch*, You may be very eaſy. Now I proceed to make good the Particulars of the Charge upon you, *Miſquotations*, *Miſconſtructions*, *Miſrepreſentations*, *Reviving of old and trite Objections concealing the Anſwers*, &c. Theſe, I think, reach to about twenty Particulars, which ſhall all be conſidered in the ſame Order as laid down in my *Defenſe*.

I. I charged you * with a *Miſquotation* † of *Polycarp*'s Doxology, recorded in the Epiſtle of the Church of *Smyrna*. You left out, as I ſaid, the two moſt material Words, σὺν αὐτῷ, on which the Biſhop's Argument chiefly depended. You acknowledge in your *Reply* (p. 13.) that you left thoſe Words out, and the reaſon you give, is, becauſe *They are neither in the Edition of Biſhop* Uſher, *nor of* Cotelerius, *from whom you cited the Paſſage*. This Anſwer, give me leave to ſay, is more unkind to your

* *See my* Defenſe, p. 406. † *Diſquiſit. Mod.* p. 22.

ſelf

ſelf than the *Charge* I made. I had compared the different Readings of the *Doxology* in the two Editions, *Euſebius*'s and Biſhop *Uſher*'s. I conſidered that if you ſhould pretend to follow Biſhop *Uſher* and *Cotelerius*, you had falſified in two places, changing μεθ' ἧς into δι' ἧς, and καὶ πνεύματι into ἐν πνεύματι, which are very material Alterations. But if you ſhould pretend to copy from *Euſebius*, there you had left out σὺν αὐτῷ. The latter being a Sin of *Omiſſion* only, and more excuſable than puting Words into the Text, I choſe to fix the Charge there where it might fall the lighteſt, and ſeem rather a Slip than any ill Deſign. I had another Reaſon why I was willing to charge it as an *Omiſſion* out of the Text of *Euſebius*; and That was becauſe Biſhop *Bull* had followed *Euſebius*'s Copy. Now if you had a mind to take another Reading from *Uſher* and *Cotelerius*, you ſhould have given Notice that Biſhop *Bull* had made uſe of a faulty Copy, before you had triumph'd over Him; and ſhould have obſerved that *Uſher*'s and *Cotelerius*'s Reading was the true one. But not a word do you ſay of This; and the Reaſon of your deep Silence, in this reſpect, is very evident. Biſhop *Bull*'s Argument was ſtrong and good, according to *Euſebius*'s Reading: And according to *Uſher*'s and *Cotelerius*'s it would have been ſtill ſtronger and fuller. Since therefore Neither of the *Readings* would ſerve your Purpoſe, you lay aſide Both, and invent a new one of your own *: And then you might ſecurely inſult over the learned Prelate, having a *Text* and *Comment* Both of your own contriving.

* *The Readings of the Paſſage.*
Δι' ἧς σοι σὺν αὐτῷ, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, Euſeb. E. H. l. 4. c. 15.
Δι' ἧς σοι, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, Whitby. Diſq. Mod. p. 22.
Μεθ' ἧς σοι καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, Uſher, Coteler.

But

But, you say, the Words, *as they lie in* Eusebius *thus*, δι' αὐτῦ σὺν αὐτῷ (you mean δι' ἓ σὺν αὐτῷ) *want good Sense, it being improper to say* by the Son *be Glory to the Father* with *the Son*. Be it *proper*, or *improper*, you ought to cite Passages of Authors, as you find Them: Besides that very wise Men, Antient and Modern, have judged the Expression very *proper*: And it will be thought that the Compilers of our *Communion Office*, who scrupled not to say *by whom, and with whom* &c. understood what *good Sense* is, as well as the *Modest Enquirer*.

II. A second *Misquotation* * I charged † upon you was of a Passage in *Athenagoras* ‡. You was pleased to change πρὸς αὐτῦ into πρὸς αὐτὸν, for no Reason that I could see, but to make a weak Insinuation against the *Divinity* of God the Son. In your *Reply* (p. 13.) you say; *Now This, I confess, is casually done, but* (you mean *and*) *without design*. But these *casual* Slips have an ill Appearance, especially in so noted a place as this of *Athenagoras*. You could not forget that this very πρὸς αὐτῦ, in *Athenagoras*, is what we set a particular note and value upon, as showing that the Antients did not always say δι' αὐτῦ only, in respect of the Son's Part, or Office in the Work of Creation, but sometimes πρὸς αὐτῦ, A Phrase which may express the *efficient* Cause, and is not liable to the same Exceptions as the Phrase δι' αὐτῦ. Now, to falsify a Testimony of this kind, tho' *casually*, betrays however great Negligence, or Oscitancy. You observe that *ab eo tanquam Exemplari*, serves as well your Turn, as *ad eum tanquam Exemplar*. That is, if we will allow you your Construction. But you cannot make the former so easily,

* Whitby. *Disqu. Mod.* p. 62.

† Defense *p.* 406.

‡ Πρὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ, ᾧ δι' αὐτῦ πάντα ἐγένετο. Athen. *p.* 38. Ox.

or

or ſo probably, out of πρὸς αὐτῦ, as the latter, out of πρὸς αὐτὸν: Beſides that by changing πρὸς αὐτῦ into πρὸς αὐτὸν, you took from us one Senſe of the Words which we might think it proper to inſiſt upon, namely, That of an *efficient Cauſe*. Πρὸς αὐτῦ, if it may be conſtrued your way, may alſo be conſtrued another way, and perhaps more naturally: And therefore we take it not well to be deprived of any Advantage which the Text gives us. I muſt however obſerve, that whatever your deſign was from theſe Words, They will not anſwer your purpoſe, even tho' we ſhould admit your Conſtruction. For no Conſequence can be drawn againſt our Principles, from the Conſideration of the Son's being the *Exemplar*, after which *all Things* were *made*; unleſs you can imagine that He was an *Exemplar* to Himſelf.

III. The third Thing I charged you with *, was a *Miſconſtruction* † of a celebrated Paſſage in *Methodius* ‡. The Paſſage I had produced in my *Defenſe*, to prove the *eternal Generation* of the Son, as Biſhop *Bull* alſo had done **. You expreſs'd your ſelf ſomewhat obſcurely in anſwer to the Biſhop. Only this was plain from your Words, (*Fruſtra Præſule renitente*) that you intended ſomething oppoſite to the Biſhop, and inſinuated to your Reader that this Quotation of *Methodius* proved the very contrary to what the Biſhop alledged it for. Now the Biſhop had cited it in proof of the *Conſubſtantiality*, and *Coeternity* of the Son: To which purpoſes it is indeed as full and clear as any can be deſired. You are pleaſed however, in your *Reply* (p. 15.) to object as follows.

* Defenſe, p. 406.
† *Diſquiſit. Mod.* p. 75, 76.
‡ *Method. apud Phot.* p. 960. *See my* Defenſe. p. 143.
** Bull. *Def. Fid. Nic.* p. 164. 200.

1. That

1. That *to say that the Son of God was pre-existent before the Ages in the Heavens, is to say no more than all the* Arians *and* Semi-arians *have asserted*, &c. But the Force of the Bishop's Argument and Mine did not lie in the Words, πρὸ αἰώνων (tho' They are not without their Weight *), however the *Arians* or *Semi-arians* might *equivocate*) but in those other Words of *Methodius*, that the *Son was, did not become, a Son*; That He had *no new Filiation*; that *He is always the same*; and in *Methodius*'s guarding against the Supposition of a *Temporal* Generation, by his explaining it of a Temporal *Manifestation* only. Why do you overlook and conceal the main Points wherein our Argument consisted, and make reply only to That which neither Bishop *Bull* nor I laid any stress upon? But it was prudent, it may be, to pass over what could not be answer'd.

2. You object to us some other Passages of *Methodius* to confront ours with. He calls the Father ἄναρχος ἀρχὴν, *a principium, that had no Beginning.* So you translate: Might you not as well have rendred it, *A Beginning that had no Beginning?* But That would not have served your purpose; The true rendring is, a *principium*, or *Head*, that has no *principium*, or *Head.* But you had a mind to the words *no Beginning*, to insinuate as if *Methodius* had said this of God the Father in Contra-distinction to God the Son, who *had a Beginning*; tho' *Methodius* says no such Thing. He says indeed that the Son is ἀρχὴ, a *Principle*, or *Head*, after the Father: That is, the Son is the *Fountain* of all Things, *after* the Father; not in *Time*, but in *Order*; the Father being always primarily consider'd, as *Head* and *Father* of the Son. The Sum then of what *Methodius* has there said, is that the *Son* has a *Father*, and that the *Father* has

* *See my* Defense, p. 139, &c.

*none.*

*None*. What *Catholick* would ever ſcruple to aſſert the ſame Thing? No one ever doubted but that the Father alone was ἄναρχος, the Son not ἄναρχος in this Senſe *.

3. You object, thirdly, the following *Words*, (for I ſee not the *Senſe*) "Methodius *adds that theſe Words* "*might be congruouſly applied to Him* (the Son) In the "Beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth; "*and Thoſe of* Solomon, The Lord created Me the Be- "ginning of his ways. Now what can an *Engliſh* Reader make of theſe two Paſſages, as you have repreſented Them and tacked Them together? From the laſt of them, I ſuppoſe, He is to underſtand that the Son was *created*, according to *Methodius*. But then, what will He make of the Text out of *Geneſis?* Is He to underſtand that the Son was *created* with the Heavens and the Earth, in the *Beginning*? So one might think, and you are very indifferent, I perceive, what your *Engliſh* Reader may apprehend, provided you may but ſeem to have ſomething to ſay; and ſomething that may reflect Diſhonour on the Son of God. As to the Paſſage in *Geneſis*, *Methodius* interprets ἐν ἀρχῇ (which we render *in the Beginning*) *in the Principle*; underſtanding by *Principle* God the Son, *in whom* all Things were created, according to St. *Paul*, Coloſſ. 1. 17. Now ſince, according to *Methodius*, all Things whatever were *created* in the ἀρχῇ, *i. e.* in God the Son, it is plain that He exempts Him from the Number of *Creatures*. As to the other Text, out of *Solomon*'s Proverbs, you have, without any Ground or Warrant from *Methodius*, render'd ἔκτισε *created*, inſtead of *appointed*, or *conſtituted*. The meaning, probably is, according to *Methodius*, that the Father *appointed* or *conſtituted*, God the Son as the

* Vid. Gregor. Naz. Orat. 35. p. 563. Damaſcen. de Fid. l. 1. c. 11. p. 42.

ἀρχὴ, the *Principium*, *Foundation*, or *Head* over all *Creatures*. This kind of Conſtruction of that Place of the *Proverbs*, appears to have been known and received in the Church, ſome Time before *Methodius*; as is plain from *Dionyſius* of *Rome* *, his Comment upon the Text: which was afterwards countenanc'd by *Euſebius* †, and other *Catholick* Writers ‡. *Athenagoras*, much earlier than any of them, muſt have underſtood the Text nearly in the ſame Senſe. For, after He had declared expreſly againſt the Son's being *made*, or *created*, aſſerting his *Proceſſion* from the Father to be a kind of *Subſtratum*, or *Support* for the World of Creatures to ſubſiſt in, receiving from thence their proper Forms, Order, and Perfection; He immediately cites this Text out of the *Proverbs*, as confirming his Sentiments **. To return to *Methodius*: He barely cites the Text to prove that Chriſt was *prior* to the *Creation*, and that all Creatures had their Subſiſtence in Him. He is not ſo particular in explaining the Senſe of ἔκτισε, as *Dionyſius* of *Rome*, or *Euſebius*: But it is more than probable that He underſtood it much in the ſame Senſe. Certain it is, that your Conſtruction of Him is intirely unwarranted; and not only ſo, but contradictory to the Author's known Principles elſewhere. Upon the

* Ἔκτισε γὰρ συναῦξαι ἀκεσέον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπέφησε τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγονόσιν ἔργοις, γεγονέσι δὲ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Dionyſ. Rom. apud Athanaſ. p. 232.

† Ἄρχειν δὲ τ' ὅλων ὑπὸ κυρίε Ϛ αὐτοῦ πατρὸς καθατεπαρμένον· τοῦ ἔκτισεν ἐνταῦθ' ἀντὶ τοῦ κατέπαξεν, ἢ καθέφησεν εἰρημένε. Euſeb. Eccl. Theol. l. 3. p. 151.

‡ Non enim ita *Sapientiam* Suam condidit, quaſi aliquando ſine *Sapientia* fuerit —— Hoc Initium habeat *Sapientia* Dei quod de Deo *proceſſit* ad creanda omnia tam cæleſtia quam terrena; non quo cæperit eſſe in Deo. *Creata* eſt ergo *Sapientia*, imo genita, non ſibi quæ ſemper erat, ſed His quæ ab ea fieri oportebat. *Pſeud-Ambroſ. de Fid. Orth.* c. 2. p. 349.

** Vid. Athenag *c.* 10. *p.* 38, 39, 40.

who

whole, you have not been able to anſwer Biſhop *Bull*'s Citations out of *Methodius*, nor to make good your own Pretences againſt *Methodius*'s Orthodoxy. Inſtead of taking off one *Miſconſtruction* which I had charged you with, you have only added to it: And have been ſo far from acquitting your ſelf of your firſt Offenſe, that you have more than doubled it.

IV. A fourth Thing which I charged * upon you, was a Miſrepreſentation and Miſconſtruction † of a Paſſage in Dr. *Cave* ‡. I blamed you for inſinuating as if Dr. *Cave* had ſaid, or meant, that many, or moſt of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers were againſt the *Divinity* and *Eternity* of Chriſt. That you really intended to inſinuate as much, is confeſs'd in your *Reply*, where you tell me (p. 26.) that *the natural import of the Words* (Dr. *Cave*'s Words) *contains a full Confutation of the whole Deſign of my Book, which is to prove that all the* Ante-Nicene *Fathers maintain'd the Conſubſtantiality of the Son with the Father, and the eternal Generation of the Son.*

I have not miſtaken then as to the Matter of Fact, that you really did *inſinuate* what I had *charged* you with. That you was *to blame* for ſo doing, will eaſily be made appear as plainly as the other. Two Things I before obſerved, *1ſt.* That Dr. *Cave*'s Words ought not, without a manifeſt *neceſſity*, to have been interpreted to a Senſe directly oppoſite to his well known and often declared Sentiments. 2. That there was no ſuch *manifeſt Neceſſity* in the Caſe before us; but rather ſome probable Grounds, even from the Paſſage it ſelf, for interpreting Dr. *Cave*'s Words otherwiſe than you have done. Now as to Dr. *Cave*'s real Sentiments, relating to the Faith

* *Defenſe of Queries*, p. 407.
† Whitby. *Diſquiſ. Mod.* p. 97.
‡ Cave. *Hiſtor. Liter.* Vol 1. p. 112.

of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, I appeal to the Paſſages appearing in the *Margin* *. You may there ſee that Dr. *Cave* look'd upon the *Eternity* of the Son as part of the Chriſtian Faith from the very *Infancy* of the *Church*; that it had been *conſtantly* taught by the *Catholick* Fathers; and that none but meer Strangers to *Antiquity* could make any Queſtion of it: That the moſt effectual way to confute *Arians*, &c. is,

* *Æternitatem* Filii, ejuſque σύνδρομον τῇ ἀρχῇ τὸ εἶναι (quemadmodum non inſcite loquitur *Cyrillus Alexandrinus*) *concurrentem cum paterno principio exiſtentiam*, conſtanter docuiſſe Catholicos Patres, Antiquitatis Eccleſiaſticæ rudis plane ſit oportet qui neſcire poteſt; nec pluribus jam probare opus eſt quod cumulate præſtiterunt Alii. Hanc Eccleſiæ Fidem ab ipſis *Chriſtianiſmi Primordiis* traditam, & *perpetuo conſervatam*, omni quo potuerunt niſu totiſque viribus oppugnarunt *Ariani*. *Cav. Diſſ.* 3. *ad Calc. Hiſt. Lit.* p. 79.

Liquet, non eſſe efficaciorem *Hæreſes* refutandi rationem, quam ſi poſt allegatam SS. Scripturæ Auctoritatem, *Conſtantem* & *Univerſalem* veterum Conſenſum ad Partes noſtras advocemus. Expertus eſt id *Theodoſius Imperator* An. 383; quando Catholicos Epiſcopos cum *Arianis*, *Macedonianis*, *Eunomianis*, coacta Synodo, confligere vellet; Suadebat potius *Nectario* & *Agellio*, qui Ipſum conſuluerant, *Siſinnius*, ut interrogarent *Hæreticos* iſtos num admitterent illos Doctores atque Interpretes Scripturarum, qui ante Eccleſiæ Diſſidium floruiſſent. *Cav. Ep. Apolog.* p. 22. Vid. etiam p. 17.

Monebo tantum, in Patrum Scriptis Dogmata Philoſophica a *Fidei Articulis* probe eſſe diſtinguenda. In His, S. Literis & Catholicæ Traditioni ſtrictius ſe alligant, & in REI SUMMA OMNES CONVENIUNT: in illis majori utuntur libertate, & opiniones ſæpius adhibent quæ in Philoſophorum Scholis ventilari ſolebant; quin & in explicandis Fidei Myſteriis quandoque voces e Schola Platonica petitas admovent, ſed ad Chriſtiannm ſenſum accommodatas. *Ibid.* p. 48.

Profiteatur (*J. Clericus*) Se cum Eccleſia Catholica agnoſcere, Deum eſſe Eſſentia unum, Perſonis trinum, nempe Unitatem in Trinitate, & Trinitatem in unitate ſe Colere ac Venerari; credere Se, *Jeſum Chriſtum* verum eſſe & *æternum* Dei Filium, Patri vero ὁμοούσιον, & συναΐδιον ——— tunc demum intelligemus Fidem ejus in principibus his Doctrinæ Chriſtianæ Capitibus, rectam eſſe, Orthodoxam, & tam Sacræ Scripturæ, quam *primævæ Antiquitati* congruam. *Cav. Ep. Apolog.* p. 107.

after

after Scripture, to appeal to the *Conſtant, Univerſal* Conſent of the *Antients*; with more to the ſame purpoſe. Is this the Man whom you quote on your Side? I may add that his *Apologetical Epiſtle* runs much upon this Topic, to vindicate the primitive Fathers againſt ſuch Aſperſions as You, among Others, are too apt to throw upon Them: And there needs nothing more to ſhow that He was perfectly in my Sentiments, as to that particular, and directly oppoſite to your's. You may ſay, perhaps, that Dr. *Cave* was inconſiſtent with Himſelf; and at different Times, upon different Occaſions, aſſerted repugnant Propoſitions. But, with Submiſſion, I think it a Piece of Juſtice due to every Author, eſpecially One that has bore a Character in the learned World, to ſuppoſe otherwiſe of Him, till it can be evidently made appear, that He has contradicted in one Place what He had laid down in Another. If there be any Room left for a favourable and candid Interpretation it ought to be admitted. I before obſerved to you, that there was no *manifeſt Neceſſity* of interpreting that Paſſage of Dr. *Cave*, as you do. He recounted about ſeven Errors of *Lactantius*, referring to others unnamed: And in *Thoſe*, He ſays, many of the *Antients* concurred with Him. By *in Thoſe*, He might poſſibly mean in *ſome*, or *other of them*, not in every *ſingle* particular. To make it the more probable that He really meant no more, I obſerved that *de Divinitate* ſtood as a diſtinct *Article*, and might be conſtrued *of the Deity*. *Lactantius* held very abſurd Notions of the *Deity*, as great Errors as any could be. Could Dr. *Cave* take notice of many ſmaller Slips, and never allude to Thoſe which were the greateſt of all? And yet you cannot pretend to ſay that *Many*, or indeed *Any* of the primitive Fathers concurr'd with *Lactantius* in thoſe Errors concerning the *Deity*. From whence I juſtly concluded that

that the words *in quibus*, were not to be ſtrictly underſtood of all and *ſingular* the Errors noted.

To this you reply that *Lactantius* ſays of God, that He is the Father of all Things, *whoſe Beginning cannot be comprehended:* As if This were all that *Lactantius* had ſaid. Does He not plainly aſſert that God *had a Beginning*, and that He *made Himſelf* *? You obſerve farther, that This is fully explain'd by Himſelf l. 2. c. 8. where He ſays, *God only who is not made, is from Himſelf, as we ſhewed in the firſt Book.* And what if He ſpeaks right here? Does it follow that He has not ſaid what He really has ſaid in another Place? Beſides, if you pleaſe to admit the ſame Candor of interpreting one place by another, I can ſhow you alſo where He has ſpoke very Orthodoxly of God the Son †; and can as eaſily acquit Him of the Charge of *Hereſy* with reſpect to God the Son, as you can acquit Him of the like Charge in reſpect of God the Father. In a word, His *Errors* and *Contradictions* in both Points are viſible enough: And give me leave to think that Dr. *Cave* might ſee Them; and might allude to one in the Article *de Divinitate*, and to the other in the words, *de æterna Filii exiſtentia.* For, ſurely, otherwiſe He would not have put *de* and *de*, but would rather have expreſs'd it as one Article thus; *de Divinitate atque æterna exiſtentia Filii*, and then have proceeded with another *de*, to a new Article. Upon the whole, you can never make good your point from this Paſſage of Dr. *Cave*, which is not only capable of a different Conſtruction from your's, but moſt naturally and moſt probably requires it.

* Verum quia fieri non poteſt quin id quod ſit, *aliquando eſſe eſperit*; conſequens eſt ut, quando nihil ante eum fuerit, Ipſe ante omnia ex ſeipſo ſit procreatus. ——— *Deus ipſe ſe fecit.* Lactant. *l.* 1. *c.* 7. *p.* 32.

† Vid. Lactant. *l.* 4. *c.* 9.

You

You would insinuate (*Reply*, p. 30.) from another Passage of Dr. *Cave*, where He is speaking of *Origen*, that *Origen*'s *supposed* Errors relating to the *Trinity*, were not, in Dr. *Cave*'s Judgment, contrary to any *Article of the Church*, or *Apostolical Traditions*: which again is doing That good Man a second Injury, instead of making Satisfaction for the First. Dr. *Cave* does not say that his *supposed* Errors relating to the *Trinity* were not contrary to *any Article of the Church*; but only that many of *Origen*'s censured Opinions were not: And what sort of Opinions Dr. *Cave* meant, He Himself tells us in the very place referr'd to *. Namely, *Intricate Questions that had been canvass'd only in the Schools of the Philosophers, and some Notions of his own Invention that were* minus commodæ, *not so just or accurate as They should be.* Now what is This to our present Purpose? See the Passages of Dr. *Cave* before cited, sufficiently showing that He thought the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* to be a fundamental *Article of the Church*, and an *Apostolical Tradition*. But I am weary of attending you through so many trifling Pretences. To conclude this Head: The most that can be made out of Dr. *Cave*'s Expressions here, or elsewhere, is no more than This, that some of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, in some Places of their Works, express'd themselves sometimes *improperly*, *uncautiously*, or it may be, now and then *dangerously*, in respect of the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*, before the meaning of Terms was adjusted, and settled; and those Articles reduced to a more *certain*, and more *accurate Form* of Expression. In the *Sum* of the *Matter*, in the *main Doctrine*, the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers were agreed. This was Dr. *Cave*'s real Judgment; as may be seen by his own Words before cited: And, I suppose, He may be allowed to be his own best Interpreter. He was not only in those Senti-

* Histor. Liter. Vol. 1. p. 77.

ments,

ments, but *zealous* for Them, being a true Lover and Admirer of the primitive Fathers. How would the good Man have been filled with Indignation to have found His Name, and His Authority made uſe of, to ſuch purpoſes as you have done! But enough —

V. I charged * you farther, as reporting falſely, that the Titles of τῦ παντὸς ποιητὴς, and τ̃ ὅλων δημιεργὸς (That is, *Creator*, or *Framer* of the Univerſe) were ſuch as the Writers of the *ſecond Century* always diſtinguiſh'd the *Father* from the *Son* by. I was indeed ſo tender in this Point, as not abſolutely to charge this *Falſehood* upon you: But I obſerved that either This muſt have been your Meaning, or elſe you had made a very trifling Obſervation. Thoſe Words of your's on which I grounded my Remark, I have now thrown into the Margin †, for every *Latin* Reader to judge of. You defend your ſelf (*Reply*, p. 16.) with theſe Words: *The Words of* Athenagoras *there cited are theſe*, One unbegotten and eternal Maker of all Things. By which Epithets, *&c. Now of theſe Epithets thus joined, my Words are certainly true; nor had the* Doctor *any right to ſeparate what I had thus joined.* One can hardly forbear ſmiling at This invented Anſwer. If what you now pretend was really your Meaning, How came you to ſay Epithets, in the Plural, rather than Epithet in the Singular? Why did you diſtinguiſh the ſeveral Epithets with Comma's? Again, why did you take

* *Defenſe of Queries*, p. 409.

† Ex quibus omnibus, ex *Athenagora* Sententia, Deum illum unum Quem Chriſtiani prædicabant, non alium fuiſſe quam Deum ingenitum, æternum, τοῦ παντὸς ποιητὴν, τ̃ ὅλων δημιεργὸν, *omnium Opificem*, liquet. Quibus Epithetis illius Sæculi Scriptores Deum Patrem a Filio ſemper diſtinguebant, Deumque Filium ab Hoc omnium Opifice ex eo diſtingui docuerunt, quod ſit Ille *per Quem*, aut cujus Miniſterio Pater fecit omnia. *Whitby. Diſqu. Modeſt.* p. 60.

ſuch

such particular notice of *per Quem*, *By Whom*, which you say was attributed to the Son, to distinguish Him from Him that was *omnium Opifex*, *Maker of all Things*. Does not your Sense here, and your Sense in what went before (as I have represented it) answer to each other, like Two Tallies, exactly? I defy any Man that reads your Words in the *Latin*, to understand you otherwise. But if you will needs have it that you intended only to say that the Epithet of *one unbegotten and eternal Maker of all Things*, was *peculiar* to the Father, in the *second Century*, you shall have the Honour of making a shrowd Observation, when you tell me, in what *Century* downwards to this day, That *Epithet* has not been *peculiar* to the Father as much as Then. I before left you the *Alternative*, either of being found *trifling* in a peculiar manner, or making a *false Report*; and so I do still. One might think by what follows in your Reply to this Article, that you had a mind to own the *Report*, and to vindicate it from the Charge of Falshood.

You say, *Justin Martyr* made a *difference between the word* ποιητὴς *and* δημιουργὸς, and a little after, that *He always speaketh of the Son as being another, not from the* δημιουργὸς, *the Builder, Framer*, or *Artificer, but* ἀπὸ τ̃ ποιητ̃ τ̃ παντὸς, or τ̃ ὅλων, *from the Maker of all Things*, Reply, *p.* 17, 18. However that be, I showed you plainly, from three express Testimonies *, that *Irenæus*, of the same Century with *Justin*, made no such Difference. The Son is ποιητὴς τ̃ πάντων, *Maker of all Things*, according to *Irenæus*, over and over, in as full and strong words as the Father Himself can be: So that your Remark, as to the Writers of the *second* Century, has no Truth in it. What you observe of *Justin*, is not

* *See my* Defense, *p.* 189.

ſtrictly true. He tells us * indeed, that *Plato* made a difference between ποιητὴς, and δημιουργὸς, underſtanding by the former one that *makes* a thing from nothing, and by the latter one that *frames* any thing out of *pre-exiſtent* Matter. *Juſtin* takes notice of this, in order to ſhow that *Plato*'s inferior Gods muſt be *corruptible*, upon *Plato*'s own Principles: For the *great God* is ſtiled by *Plato*, not ποιητὴς, but δημιουργὸς of the other *Gods*. Conſequently They were made of Matter, which is corruptible, and therefore are *corruptible* Themſelves. What is this to the purpoſe we are upon? Or how does it appear that *Juſtin* himſelf always obſerved *Plato*'s Diſtinction? Beſides that if He did, it is certain that *Juſtin Martyr* ſuppoſes God the Son to be ποιητὴς, or *Maker* of Man whom He calls the ποίημα, *Creature* of Chriſt †. And there is no reaſon to doubt, but that He ſuppoſed Him to be as truly ποιητὴς, *Maker* of all other Things, according to the conſtant Doctrine of the Church in that very Century, as appears from *Irenæus*, *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, and Others.

You go on, in purſuance of your firſt Miſtake, to obſerve that δημιουργὸς *being of an inferior Senſe to that of* ποιητὴς τ᾽ ὅλων, *it is no wonder that the Fathers ſometimes give it to the Son under one of theſe Diſtinctions, where they ſay with* Origen *the Father is* πρῶτος δημιουργὸς, *the firſt or chief Worker, the Son is ſo in a ſecondary Senſe.* This is writing juſt as if you had never ſeen the Fathers. I repeat it, that *Irenæus* gives Both thoſe Titles indifferently to God the Son, as do other Fathers after Him; which you might have ſeen in my *Defenſe* (p. 189.) Yet you are loth to admit even ſo much as δημιουργὸς to have been

* Juſt. Mart. Paræn. p. 91. Ox. Ed.
† Juſt. Mart. Dial. p. 187. Jeb.

applied

applied to the Son, except with a Distinction; *quoting*, I would say, *misquoting Origen* to countenance your Pretences. If you please to look again into *Origen* *, the Word is πρώτως not πρῶτος, signifying not that the Father is the *First Worker*, as if there were *Two Workers*, but that He is *primarily* Creator. And, what ruines all your fine airy Speculations at once, *Origen*, in that very place, asserts the Son ποιῆσαι (not δημιουργεῖν) τὸν κόσμον, to *Make*, not *Frame* only, the World: which is as much as if He had called Him τῷ κόσμῳ, or τῶν ὅλων ποιητής.

You quote *Eusebius* as stiling the Father ἀπάντων δημιουργὸς, the Son αἴτιος δεύτερος. You should have remember'd that the same *Eusebius* stiles the Son ὁ μέγας τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸς. † Had This been applied to the *Father* instead of the *Son*, what Speculations might we not have expected upon the Force of ὁ μέγας, the *Great* Creator? You forget also that *Eusebius* scruples not to use the Title of ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων, *Maker of all Things*, speaking of the *Son*; as I observed in my *Defense* ‡. This is directly against you: And if there be some Expressions in *Eusebius* which We neither approve nor vindicate; so there are many others that You cannot approve, or make consistent with your Principles: Quotations therefore from *Eusebius* will signify little on either Side. What you produce (*Reply* p. 18.) out of *Methodius* has been solidly answer'd by Bishop *Bull* **.

You next cite *Tatian*, as *a true Disciple of* Justin Martyr, saying, that *Matter is produced* ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντων δημιουργοῦ, *from the Maker of all Things*, but

* Origen. Contr. Celf. p. 317.
† Euseb. Eccl. H l. 10. c. 4. p. 316.
‡ *Defense of Queries*, p. 189.
** Bull. *Def. Fid. Nic.* p. 165.

*the Son was* ἑαυτῷ τὴν ὕλλω δημιουργήσας, *Worker of this Matter.* But sure the *Disciple* was strangely forgetful of his *Master*'s Distinction between ποιητὴς and δημιουργὸς: Otherwise, when He was talking of God's *producing* Matter, He should have stiled Him ποιητὴς, not δημιουργὸς. And you are as forgetful of what you had said but the Page before: Otherwise you should have made the Father no more than *Worker* of the Matter, as well as the Son; because of the word δημιουργὸς. See how strangely you are bewildred in your Observations, confuting and contradicting your self. Nothing succeeds with you; and I will venture to predict that nothing will, so long as you are espousing the Cause of *Heresy*, in Opposition to the Faith of the *Catholick* Church.

VI. I charged you, sixthly, with three Misrepresentations together: One relating to *Basil*, the other Two to *Athanasius* *. *Basil* you represented as declaring against Unity of *Essence*, where He *intended* nothing but against Unity of *Person*. To which you make answer (*p.* 21.) that you *dived not into* Basil's *Intentions*, *but cited his Words fairly*, viz. *that the* Sabellian *Doctrine* was *corrected by the word Consubstantial.* A pretty way This, to cite Authors without considering whether They *intended* any thing to the purpose They are cited for, or no. You cited † *Basil*, to prove that two Things *Consubstantial* make *two Essences*; whereas *Basil* meant no more than that They make two *Persons*. This you call *fairly citing his Words.* You mean, I suppose, that you *fairly* transcribed his Words, at the same Time very *unfairly* perverting his Sense.

As to *Athanasius*, I observed that you understood

* *See my* Defense, p. 409.

† *Disquisit. Mod.* p. 32. Præf.

what

what He had ſaid againſt the ὁμοιούσιον, as if it had been ſaid againſt the ὁμούσιον, betwixt which Two, that accurate Father always careſully diſtinguiſh'd. To this you reply, that you cited *Athanaſius* to confirm this Propoſition, that *They who ſay the Eſſence of the Son is like, or equal, to that of the Father, do by that aſcribe to Him another numerical Eſſence from That of the Father.* I perceive, you do not yet underſtand a Syllable of what *Athanaſius* was ſpeaking about. See his meaning explain'd in my *Defenſe*, pag. 409. *Athanaſius* is ſo far from ſuppoſing *like*, and *equal* to be equivalent, or even conſiſtent, that He denies That Eſſence to be *equal*, which is only *like*; and He is not obſerving that either an *equal*, or a *like Eſſence* muſt be another *numerical* Eſſence, but that an Eſſence which is only *like* to *divine*, muſt be an *inferior* Eſſence. It is very ſtrange, that after a Key had been given you to that Paſſage in *Athanaſius*, you ſhould ſtill go on, as before, to confound your Self, and your Readers. As to the other *Miſrepreſentation* of *Athanaſius*, whom you ſuppoſe an Aſſertor of *numerical Identity* (which is making Him a *Sabellian*, according to your Senſe of *Numerical*) as to this Charge upon you, you are pleaſed to ſay never a Word. That therefore ſtands as it did.

VII. In the next place, I blamed you for repreſenting *Barnabas*'s Epiſtle, ἐν νόθοις, interpreting it *Spurious*, tho' That be not the Senſe of ἐν νόθοις, as it lies in *Euſebius*. To This you make anſwer (*p.* 20.) that you *neither there, nor elſewhere interpret thoſe Words at all.* This is another Inſtance wherein you appear to be more unkind to your ſelf, than I had been to you. You declare, page 19*th* of your *Diſquiſitions*, that *Barnabas*'s Epiſtle was by the *Antients* held for *Spurious*. This falſe Aſſertion appeared to have ſome *Colour*, ſuppoſing that you interpret

terpret ἐν νόθοις in *Eusebius*, to mean *Spurious*: But without That, you have made a *misreport* of the *Antients*, and have no Pretence at all for it. Show me what *Antients*, or where They reckon'd *Barnabas*'s Epistle *Spurious* *. If you chuse rather to have it thought that you have told us an Untruth without any *Colour* for it, than with any, be it so: I was willing to put the most *candid* Construction upon the Thing; and I shall do so still, if you will give me leave. For, I observe that after you had said † that *Eusebius* ranked this Epistle ἐν νόθοις, you immediately subjoin these Words, Cotelerius *confesses that He inclines to the Opinion of Those who think it is not the Apostle's.* Now, this is so very like Commenting on the Phrase, ἐν νόθοις, just going before, that hardly one Reader in a Hundred could ever suspect that you understood by ἐν νόθοις, any thing else but *Spurious*; that is, falsly ascrib'd to *Barnabas*. In a word, It seems to me very much the same thing, whether you *interpret* a Passage thus, or whether you lead your Reader into such *Interpretation:* The Reader is equally deceived either way. However, if you insist upon it, that you neither *interpreted* the Words at all, nor intended to lead your Reader into any such *Interpretation*, I acquiesce; provided only that you give us any tolerable Account of your saying that this Epistle was look'd upon as *Spurious* by the *Antients*.

VIII. The next Thing which I found fault

* Certe quicquid de hac Epistola dicant recentiores Critici, eam *Barnabæ* nostro constanter ascribunt *veteres*. *Nemo certe fuit*, inquit ὁ πανὺ Cestriensis noster, *qui* hanc *Epistolam* Barnabæ *non tribuerit; neque in ea quidquam apparet, quod eam ætatem non ferat.* Cav. Histor. Literar. Vol. 1. p. 11.

† Disqu. Mod. p. 9.

with

with *, was your partial Account of the antient *Doxologies* †. To This you reply *(p. 19.)* that you *freely acknowledge your Account of the primitive Doxologies to be imperfect, as wanting the* Doxologies *of St.* Paul *and St.* Jude, *which are the beſt Rule and Standard of Doxologies.* What? better than St. *John*'s, or St. *Peter*'s? But This it is to aim at Wit. You may pleaſe to remember that we were not talking of the *Scripture-Doxologies*, but of thoſe which are to be met with in the Writings of the Fathers. You had told us in your *Diſquiſitions* a notorious Untruth, that the Fathers of the firſt and ſecond Century never uſed that Form of *Doxology*, which has been eſpecially called *Catholick*; but that the *Arian* Form had obtained among the early Fathers. This *falſe* Account, I ſoftly called a *partial* Account; to be as tender of you as poſſible. It is well known that μετὰ, or σὺν, in *Doxologies*, is the ſame as if the particle καὶ be uſed to connect the Perſons: And all ſuch Forms come under the Name of *Catholick*, as oppoſed to ſuch *Forms* as have only διὰ, or ὑπὸ: Becauſe, tho' Either of thoſe Forms may indifferently be uſed, and have been uſed by *Catholicks* both in former and latter Times: Yet after the *Arians* had perverted One to an ill Senſe, the *Catholicks* choſe for the moſt part, to make uſe of the Other. Now of thoſe called *Catholick* Forms, I referr'd to *Polycarp*'s ‡, the Church of *Smyrna*'s **, and *Clemens*'s of *Alexandria* ††, all

* *Defenſe of Queries*, p. 410. † Diſqu. Mod. p. 23.

‡ Μεθ' οὗ σοι καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα &c. Polycarp.

** Μεθ' οὗ δόξα τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, Eccleſ. Smyrn.

†† Τῷ μόνῳ πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ, υἱῷ καὶ πατρὶ, παιδαγωγῷ καὶ διδασκάλῳ ἡμῶν, σὺν καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι· πάντα τὰ ἐνὶ οὖ ὧν τὰ πάντα. δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα ἓν, εἰ' ὃν τὸ ἀεί. οὗ μέλη πάντες. οὗ δόξα, αἰῶνες· πάντα τῷ ἀγαθῷ, πάντα τῷ καλῷ πάντα τῷ σοφῷ, τῷ δικαίῳ τὰ πάντα· ὧ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Clem. Alex. Pædag. l. 3. p. 311. Ox. Ed.

within

within the Two first Centuries, and standing Evidences of the *Falsehood* of your Report, supposing you meant that neither μετὰ, nor σὺν, nor καὶ were applied in Doxologies to the *Son* or *Holy-Ghost*. Indeed, if any of them are applied to Either of those two Persons, it is a Contradiction to the *Arian* Pretence that Neither of Them should be glorified *with* the Father, but the Father glorified *in*, or *by* Them. You tell me by way of *Reply* (p. 20.) *that the Words of* Polycarp, *and the Church of* Smyrna, *comparing the Variation of Copies, are certainly against me.* How *certainly*? I know of no *Variation* there is with respect to the Church of *Smyrna*'s: *Eusebius*'s Copy, being but an Abstract, wants the latter part of the Epistle. As to the *Variation* of *Polycarp*'s, it cannot be pretended to make any thing *certain* against me, unless it be *certain* that *Eusebius*'s Reading be the better of the two; which is by no means probable. Besides, that at the worst, σὺν is applied to the Son, even in *Eusebius*'s Copy: I suppose, you do not insist upon the *Variation* of your own contriving. Besides these, *Clemens* his *Doxology* will still stand good against you, and St. *Basil*'s Testimony concerning the Doxologies of the earlier Centuries *, tho' the Doxologies produced by Him reach no higher up than the beginning of the Third. But the Subject of *Doxologies* having been accurately handled of late by Others, I shall content my self with referring to their learned and useful Tracts upon it †.

IX. I censured your Account of *Justin Martyr*, as being one continued Misrepresentation. I consi-

* Basil. de Sp. S. c. 29. p. 218. 222.

† *Seasonable Review of* Mr. Whiston's *Account of primitive Doxologies. Second Review by the same Hand.*
*Bishop of* London's *Letter defended. By a* Believer.

dered

dered what I said; and shall now justify my Censure. You are pleased, indeed, to put on a more than usual Air of Assurance upon this Occasion. The *brightest Evidence of Truth* is what you pretend to, (*p.* 31.) You resolve to *vindicate* your Self from this *false Imputation*, and to *make* Me *sensible of my Conduct*; that I have *very artificially*, *very falsly represented* Justin Martyr (*p.* 31.) have been guilty of *pious Frauds*, and *notorious Artifice* (*p.* 37.) such *Artifice and Fraud as you have seldom met with* (ibid.) *A Crowd of Falshoods* and *Misrepresentations* you charge upon me (*p.* 40.) Yet, after all these big Words, and fine Flourishes, (the Feeble vaunts of a desperate Cause that needs them) I will venture to refer the Matter in dispute to any Man of tolerable Capacity, and moderate Skill in the learned Languages. I intimated in my *Defense* (*p.* 432.) the Drift and Design of *Justin Martyr*'s Dialogue, of that Part which we are now principally concern'd with. It was to show that there was a *divine Person*, One who was really God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, and was not the *Father*, but was the *Logos*, or *Christ*. This Account of *Justin*, I will first demonstrate to be true and right; and next show how easy it is to take off all your boasted *Reasons*, or rather *Cavils* to the contrary.

1. *Justin Martyr* observes, in the Beginning of his Dialogue †, that the Christians acknowledged *no other God*, than the *Jews* did. "There never will be, *O* "*Trypho*, nor ever was, since the World began, *ano-*"*ther God* (ἄλλος Θεὸς) besides the *Maker* and "*Disposer* of the Universe: Nor do we imagine that "our's is one God, and your's Another, but it is "one and the same, that brought your Fathers out of

* *Defense of Queries*. p. 410.
† Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 34. Jeb.

" *Egypt* with a mighty Hand, and ſtretched-out Arm:
" Nor do we reſt our Hopes in any Other (for
" there is none Other) but in Him whom you Hope
" in, the God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*. From hence may be ſeen how far *Juſtin* is from aſſerting *two Gods*. There is not, according to Him, nor ever was, nor will be ἄλλος Θεὸς, *another God* beſides the God of the *Jews*, the God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*. Thus far He and *Trypho* were agreed.

2. It was agreed likewiſe between *Juſtin* and *Trypho*, that one certain Perſon, the ſame that created the World, and who is often ſpoke of in the old Teſtament, as *Creator* of the Univerſe; who was own'd by the *Jews* under that Title, and by Chriſtians more eſpecially under the Name of *Father*; I ſay, it was agreed that That Perſon was God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*.

3. *Juſtin Martyr*, over and above, aſſerts that *That Perſon*, had another Perſon with Him, a *real* and *proper* Son; which Son was alſo *God* and *Lord*, and God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*. This was the chief Matter in debate between *Juſtin* and *Trypho*; and upon which *Juſtin Martyr* ſpends many Pages in his *Dialogue*, alluding to it alſo elſewhere. Now, the main Point in diſpute between You and Me, is, whether This was really *Juſtin*'s meaning, or no. I muſt prove every Syllable of what I here aſſert; and therefore muſt dwell the longer upon this Article. *Juſtin*, I ſay, aſſerts *another Perſon, beſides the Father*, to be really *God*, *God of Abraham*, &c. He maintains that ἄλλός ἐστι Θεὸς *, or ἕτερός Θεὸς †, *Another is God*, which He elſewhere expreſſes by ἄλλος τὶς ‡, *another who is God*, beſides the Father; which comes to

* Juſt. Martyr. Dial. p. 147. 163.
† Juſt. Dial. p. 158. 161. 164.
‡ Juſt. Dial. p. 161. 165.

the

the same as *another Person* besides the Father. Instead of saying *Father*, He generally expresses it by the Title of *Creator of all Things*; the reason of which I conceive to be, that both He and *Trypho* received Him under that Notion; but under the Notion of *Father*, in *Justin*'s Sense, He was not received by *Trypho*, the Question betwixt them being chiefly This, whether He was a *Father* in a proper Sense, that is, whether He had really a *Son*. Hence, I conceive it is that *Justin* so often denotes the *Father* by the Title of *Maker of all Things*, rather than by the Title of *Father*. Yet He does sometimes make use of the Title of *Father*, instead of the other. He says in one place ἐχ ὁ πατὴρ ἦν, * instead of saying ἐχ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων ἦν: which, tho' not so accurate while disputing with a *Jew*, serves however to show that those two Titles were only different Expressions, denoting the same Person. *Justin*, in his first *Apology*, where He is again upon the same Argument, stiles the *Father* ὁ πατὴρ τ ὅλων, *Father of all Things*; in the same place censuring the *Jews* for not acknowledging that He had a *Son* †, that is, not acknowledging Him to be a *Father*, in a peculiar and *proper* Sense. This I take notice of to confirm what I have already observed, that it was not proper for *Justin*, in dispute with a *Jew*, to call the *Father* by a Title which the *Jews* did not own, but rather by Another which was acknowledged on both Sides; viz. *Maker of all Things*, or however, *Father of all Things*, not *Father* simply. To proceed: *Justin* asserts and often inculcates that this *Maker*, or *Father*, of *all Things* has a *Son* ‡, an *only-begotten* Son **, be-

* Just. Dial. p. 261.
† Just. Apol 1. p. 122.
‡ Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 296. 371.
** Just. Dial. p. 309.

gotten *before the Creation* [1], begotten of *Himself* [2], (ἐκ θεοῦ, and ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ) without *Abscission* or *Division* [3], *strictly* and *properly* [4] (ἰδίως, and κυρίως) a Son, and *really* (not *nominally*) distinct from Him [5]. He asserts farther and proves at large, that this very Son is really *God*, not *called* God only, but *is* God [6]: And *Justin* never says that He is God by *voluntary Appointment*, or as *Representative* of the Father; but as *Son of God*, He is *God* [7]. The same is God of the *Jews*, God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, according to *Justin*. This last particular is what You and I chiefly differ upon; and therefore I must be the more full and copious in the Proof of it.

It is a Rule and Maxim with *Justin* that God the Father never *appeared*; which, I suppose, I need not prove to you, because you your self contend for it, and in the *Title-Page* of your *Reply*, recommend the Determination of the *Sirmian* Synod in Anathematizing any that should say, the *Father* appeared to *Abraham*. Please then to take notice, that *Justin Martyr* quotes [8] *Exod.* 3. 16. where it is said, *The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of* Abraham, *of* Isaac, *and of* Jacob *appeared unto me*, &c. These Words *Justin*, upon his Principles, must have under-

1 Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 183. 187. 295, 296. 364. 375. 395. *Comp.* Apol. 1. p. 69. 90. 101. 123. Apol. 2. p. 13.

2 Just. Dial. p. 183. Apol. 1. p. 44.

3 Just. M. Dial. p. 183. 373. *Comp.* Paræn. p. 127.

4 Just. Mart. Apol. 1. p. 44. 46. Apol. 2. p. 13.

5 Justin. Dial. p. 373.

6 Ἐστι τῷ λέγεσθαι Θεὸς καὶ κύριος ἕτερος ὑπὲρ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων, ὃς καὶ Ἄγγελος καλεῖται. Dial. p. 161. Ἄγγελος καλούμενος καὶ Θεὸς ὑπάρχων. p. 187. Θεὸς καλεῖται, καὶ Θεός ἐστι καὶ ἔστι, p. 176. Θεὸν ἰσχυρὸν καὶ προσκυνητὸν χωρὶς ὄντα ἐδήλωσε, p. 231. Θεὸν φησὶν εἶναι, p. 367.

7 Just. M. Dial. p. 364. 366. 371. 370. Apol. 1. p. 123.

8 Just. M. Dial. p. 178. 779. *Comp.* Dial. p. 366.

stood

ſtood of *Chriſt:* He was the Lord God, the God of *Abraham*, &c. who *appeared*. And indeed *Juſtin* quotes the Text for that very purpoſe, to prove that Chriſt is *God*. Soon after He asks the Company, whether They did not yet perceive that He who appeared to *Moſes*, had declared *Himſelf* to be the God of *Abraham* *, &c. This Paſſage I before cited in my *Defenſe* (p. 37.) to prove that, according to *Juſtin*, *Chriſt Himſelf* was God of *Abraham*. This you complain of, very ridiculouſly (*Reply*, p. 37.) calling it a *Piece of Artifice*, and I know not what, as if I had *ſtopp'd* where I ought not; whereas it is impoſſible that *Juſtin*'s Words ſhould have any other meaning than That which I have given: The following Words in *Juſtin* are ſo far from confronting this Senſe, that They do nothing more than repeat and confirm the ſame Thing. For after *Juſtin* had thus plainly aſſerted that Chriſt was *God* of *Abraham*, &c. proving it from the Text in *Exodus*; *Trypho* objects, that poſſibly it might be an Angel only that *appeared*, and *God* (that is God the Father) might ſpeak to *Moſes* by that Angel. To which *Juſtin* replies, "Admit that both *God* and "an *Angel* were concern'd in that *Appearance* to "*Moſes*, as has been proved from the Text cited, "yet (I inſiſt upon it) that the *Maker of all* "*Things* was not the *God*, (or that Divine Perſon) "who told *Moſes* that *He Himſelf* was God of *Abra*"*ham*, and God of *Iſaac*, and God of *Jacob*; but "it was He of whom I have proved to you, that He "appeared to *Abraham*, and to *Jacob*, adminiſtring "to the Will of the Maker of all Things †. *Juſtin*

* Ὦ ἄνδρες γενοήκατε, λέγων, ὅτι ὃν λέγω Μωσῆς Ἄγγελον αὐ πυρὶ φλογὸς λελαληκέναι αὐτῷ, οὗτος αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὢν σημαίνῃ τῷ Μωσεῖ, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ; Juſt. Dial. p. 179.

† Οὐχ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶ ὅλων ἔσχε Θεὸς ὁ τῷ Μωσεῖ εἰπὼν αὐτὸν εἶναι Θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰακώβ, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀποδειχθεὶς

gocs

goes on to prove this from the Absurdity of supposing that God the Father should appear in that manner: upon which *Trypho* is convinc'd that He that *appear'd* to *Abraham*, and was called God and Lord, and was God, was not the *Maker of all Things*; not God the Father, but Another, who was also an *Angel*. Then *Justin* proceeds to give farther Proof, that none appeared to *Moses* in the Bush but He only, who is called an *Angel*, and is really God, namely Christ the Son of God. To these Testimonies I shall subjoin one more out of *Justin*'s first Apology, which in English runs thus. "Now what was said to *Moses*, out of the Bush, I am the I AM, the God "of *Abraham*, and the God of *Isaac*, and the God "of *Jacob*, and the God of thy Fathers, denotes that "They, tho' dead, are still in being, and are *Men* "of *Christ Himself* *. In this Passage, *Christ* is plainly asserted to be the ὁ ὤν, the *I am*, or God of the *Jews*, God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. By four express Testimonies out of *Justin*, this momentous Point is establish'd; And the whole Tenour of this Father's Writings confirms it. The Sum then of *Justin*'s Doctrine is This. That there is no other God besides the God of the *Jews*, the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*: That God the Father is God of the *Jews*, God of *Abraham*, &c. That there is *Another* besides the Father, who is also God of the *Jews*, God of *Abraham*, &c. and this Other is the *Logos*, or *Christ*, the *proper* and *only* Son of the Father, undivided and inseparable from Him, tho' Begotten of Him. The Conclusion from all is, that *Christ* is

ὑμῖν ὤφθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ Ἰακὼβ, τῷ δὲ παντὸς τοῦ ὅλου θελήσει ὑπηρετῶν. Just. Dial. p. 180.

* Τὸ δὲ εἰρημένον ἐκ βάτου τῷ Μωσεῖ, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακὼβ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, σημαντικὸν τοῦ ἐκ διηνεκοῦς ἐκείνους μένειν, καὶ εἶναι αὐτοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἀνθρώπους. Just. Apol. 1. p. 123. Ox.

God

God, and yet not *Another God* from the Father, but ἄλλος τὶς, another *Person* only *. This is *Justin*'s true, genuine, certain Doctrine, which being thus proved and fix'd; all your Pretences to the contrary drop at once. However, that I may not seem to neglect any thing you have to say, I shall briefly examine your Objections, one by one.

1. One is, that *Justin* often speaks of Θεὸς ἕτερος παρὰ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων. *Another God besides the Maker of all Things.* But I have shown from *Justin*'s own Interpretation, (besides that in strict Propriety, the Words require no more) that the meaning is only this, that there is ἄλλος τὶς, *another who is God:* besides Him whom both Sides acknowledged under the Title of *Maker of all Things*; that is, besides Him whom Christians call the *Father*. *Justin* then meant only that there is *another Person* besides the Father, who is also God. To this you except †, that the word *Person* or *Hypostasis* was not known to *Justin*. And what if He uses not the *Word*, might He not without the Word, assert the *Thing*? Ἄλλος τὶς really signifies, and is rightly rendered *another Person*. But you except farther, that *Justin* does not only say ἕτερος, *another*, but ἀριθμῷ ἕτερος, *another in Number*; and how can Father and Son be *numerically* the same God, if they be *numerically differing*? To which I answer that They are different Persons, *numerically* different: And that this was really *Justin*'s Sense, is manifest from his opposing the Word, ἀριθμῷ ἕτερον, *another Thing in Number* to that which ὀνόματι μόνον ἀριθμεῖται only differs *nominally*, not really ‡. He did not in-

* *See my Sermons*, p. 299, 300.
† Disquis. Mod. p. 29.
‡ Vid. Justin. Dial. p. 373.

tend

tend to say that Father and Son were *two Gods*, but only that They were more than *two Names* of the same Thing; as some *Heretick*s taught, before *Sabellius*. In this Sense, none of the *Post-Nicene* Writers ever deny'd that the Son is ἀριθμῷ ἕτερος, or ἕτερόν τι, *Another*, or *another Thing*, *really* distinct from the Father *. The same way of speaking you will find in the Church, as low as *Damascen* †. But you say, (*Mod. Disquis.* p. 29.) that the *Post-Nicene* Fathers guarded their Expressions by the Word *Hypostasis*, which *Justin* does not. And what if the Disputes which happen'd after *Justin*'s Time, made it necessary to guard such Expressions as having been used formerly without Offense, came at length to be perverted to an ill Meaning? There is nothing strange in This. It is well observed by the judicious and learned *Du-Pin*, speaking indeed of *Theognostus*, but the Remark is applicable to others of the *Antients*, who may claim the like Favour of Interpretation. "*Photius*, says He, has wrongfully accused *Theog-*
"*nostus* to have erred concerning the Divinity of the
"Son, upon the Score of a few Expressions that
"did not agree with Those of his own Age; with-
"out taking notice that tho' the Antients have spo-
"ken differently as to this Point, yet the Founda-
"tion of the Doctrine was always the same; and
"that it is an horrid Injustice to require Them to
"speak as nicely, and with as much Precaution as
"Those that lived after the Birth and Condemnation
"of *Heresies*. In a word, tho' *Justin* has not used the like *Guards* with the *Post-Nicene* Writers, since He had not the like Occasions; Yet His Sense,

* Basil. Ep. 300. p. 1070. Athan. Orat. 4. p. 619. Contr. Sabell. p. 41. Cyril. Alex. Thesaur. p. 60. 110. Ambr. de Fid. l. 3. c. 15. Greg. Nyss. Cat. Orat. cap. 1.

† Vid. Damascen. l. 1. c. 6. lib. 3. c. 6.

with-

without any such *Guards*, is plain enough to any Man that duly weighs and considers it.

2. You pretend from *Justin* (*Disqu. Mod.* p. 33.) that Christ is not *Maker of all Things*. But this you can never prove out of *Justin*: For, all that *Justin* meant, by distinguishing Christ from the *Maker of all Things*, was only This, that Christ is not *that Person*, ordinarily and eminently stiled *Maker of all Things*; that is, He is not the *Father* Himself, as some *Hereticks* pretended, and as the *Jews* in effect taught, by applying these Texts to God the *Father*, which *Justin* interprets of God the Son.

3. You object that Christ does nothing of his *own Power*. This is no where said by *Justin* of Christ, considered in his highest Capacity. *Justin* indeed admits that both the *Power* and *Substance* of the Son is derived from the *Father*. But This is a different thing from saying that Christ did nothing by his *own Power*. The Father's Power is his Power, Christ's *own* Power.

4. You object (*Disqu. Mod.* p. 30. 33.) That Christ is *no more than the Chief Power* (πρώτη δύναμις) *after the* Chief God, μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον Θεὸν. But *Justin* no where puts those Words together as you have done. He does indeed say, that the Son is the *principal Power after* (that is next in order to) *the Father of all Things* *: which is no more than to say, that He is the *next Person* to the Father, as all allow. What Inference can you draw from thence against our Principles? As to the Words πρῶτος Θεὸς, *Chief God*, it is *Plato*'s Expression, and, as such, cited by *Justin*.†

5. You object that Christ *hath all that He hath from the Father*. This is true, and acknowledged by

* Just. Mart. Apol. 1. p. 66.
† Just. Apol. 1. p. 114.

all *Catholicks*, before and after the *Nicene-Council*, from *Juſtin* * down to *Damaſcen* †.

6. You object that, according to *Juſtin* (*Diſqu.* p. 33.) *Chriſt could not be ſaved but by the Help of God.* This is ſpoke of *Chriſt*, in reſpect of his *Humanity*; and brought in among the Proofs of *Chriſt*'s being a *Man* ‡. And it was ſuitable to Chriſt's humble State on Earth, for an Example and Leſſon to other Men, to refer all to God.

7. You object that Chriſt is *manifeſtly diſtinguiſh'd from the God of Abraham.* But this is manifeſtly falſe, in your Senſe of it. Chriſt is plainly *God of Abraham*, according to *Juſtin*; as hath been before ſhown. You may ſay, if you pleaſe, that the *Father* is diſtinguiſh'd from the *God of Abraham*; which is true, as He is diſtinguiſh'd from the *Son*, who is God of *Abraham:* In like manner, I preſume, we may allow that the Son is diſtinguiſh'd from the *God of Abraham*, and leave you to make your utmoſt Advantage of it. You obſerve, that when the Son is diſtinguiſh'd from the *God of Abraham*, there is added, *beſides whom there is no other God.* From thence you may learn, that tho' the Son be God of *Abraham*, as well as the *Father*, yet there are not *two Gods of Abraham:* The Son is not *another God of Abraham*, but another Perſon only.

8. You object farther (*Diſqu. Mod.* p. 27. 33.) that Chriſt *would not ſuffer Himſelf to be called Good, but remitted that Title to the Father only* **. You ſhould have added, as *Juſtin* does in the ſame place, that Chriſt was a *Worm, and no Man, the Scorn of*

* Αὐτος αὐτοῦ τῷ εἶναι, καὶ δυνατὸς, καὶ κυρίου, καὶ θεοῦ. Juſt. Dial. p. 374.

† Πάντα ἓν ὅσα ἔχει ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχει, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι. Damaſc. de Fid. Orth. lib. 1. c. 10.

‡ Vid. Juſt. Mart. Dial. p. 298. *Comp.* 303.

** Juſt. Mart. Dial. p. 298.

*Men,*

*Men, and the out-caſt of the People:* and then the Reader would have ſeen plainly what *Juſtin* was talking about.

9. You object that Chriſt is *not called God by* Juſtin, *on account of his having the Father's Eſſence* communicated *to Him, but becauſe of his being begotten of Him before the Creation:* That is, *Juſtin* has not ſaid it in *Terms*, tho' He has in *Senſe*. To be the *proper Son* of the Father, and to be *begotten* of Him *inſeparably*, and without *Diviſion*, (which is *Juſtin*'s Doctrine) is the ſame Thing as to have the Nature or *Eſſence of the Father communicated* to Him. This is clear from *Juſtin*'s Similitudes and Illuſtrations *. For, I ſuppoſe, one *Fire* lighted of another, is of the *ſame Nature* with that other: And thus it is, that the *Nicene* Fathers ſuppoſed the Son to be, as it were, *Light of Light*; intending thereby to ſignify his *Conſubſtantiality*.

10. But you object, that the Son (according to *Juſtin) is God by the Will of the Father*. This might be underſtood in a good Senſe, had it been aſſerted by *Juſtin*. But the Paſſage which you build this upon, does not ſay ſo much; as ſhall be ſhown in another Place, and as I have before obſerved in my *Defenſe*, p. 131.

11. But *Chriſt*, you ſay, is *ſubſervient* to the Will of the Father. And what if it pleaſed the ſecond Perſon of the Bleſſed Trinity to tranſact all Matters between God the Father and Mankind: Be thankful for it, and make not your ſelf a Judge of the divine, and myſterious Diſpenſations. I obſerved in my *Defenſe*, (p. 289.) that one Perſon may be Delegate to another, without being of an *inferior Nature:* Otherwiſe one Man could not be Delegate to another. This *thin Piece of Sophiſtry*, you undertake to anſwer

* Vid. Juſt. Dial. p. 183. 373.

(*Reply*, p. 73.) in these Words. *One Man may be Delegate to another, because He is another* Individuum *of the same Species, but different in his particular Essence from Him; But dares the Doctor say the second or third Person thus differs from the first?* To which I reply, that, from your own Confession, it is manifest that meerly from *Delegation* no Argument can be drawn to *Inferiority of Nature*; which was the Point I was upon, and which is sufficiently proved by that Instance. As to the Persons differing from each other, as one Man differs from another, I readily deny any such *Difference* among the *divine* Persons: And I leave you to prove at leisure, that all *Delegation* requires it. When you can do That, I shall submit to the Charge of *Sophistry:* In the mean time, please to suffer it to lie at your own Door.

Having thus consider'd all, or however your most considerable Pretences from *Justin Martyr*, and shown them to be weak and frivolous; I hope I may have leave once more to say, that your Account of this *Father* is *one continued Misrepresentation.* You have, under this Article, took a great deal of pains to weaken the Force of an Argument which I had used in my *Defense*, Query 2*d.* p. 28, *&c.* It would break my Method too much here, to attend you in it; to show how you have left my main Arguments and Testimonies untouch'd, and have done little more than endeavoured to confront them with other Testimonies; which, notwithstanding, when rightly understood, are nothing at all to the purpose. If the Reader pleases but to consider and compare what I have said in my *Defense;* I am not apprehensive that your Pretences can have much weight with Him. However, if a proper Occasion offers, and if need be, or if I have not sufficiently obviated them already, I may perhaps take some farther notice of them, either in a

*second*

*second Part* to This, or elsewhere, whenever my Adversaries shall favour me with a large and particular Examination of the whole Piece. I shall now proceed, in my Method, to another Article of the *Charge*.

X. The tenth Thing which I charged you with (*Defense*, p. 411.) was, that in your *Disquisitions* (*p.61.*) you took occasion from the *Latin* Version to misrepresent *Athenagoras*, insinuating from it that the Son is not like the Father. Here you are so ingenuous, as to plead Guilty, and to give me leave to *Triumph*; (*Reply*, p. 14.) but with this Sting in it, that it is *the only Argument I attempted to answer*. But whether That be so or no, our Readers, I suppose, may be the propereſt Judges; to whom I leave it and proceed.

XI. I charged you farther (*Defense*, p. 411.) with another Misconstruction of a Passage in *Athenagoras*; a very famous one, and of Singular use in this Controversy. You appeared to Me to construe the Words ἐχ ὡς γενόμενον *, *not as eternally generated*; which is a very new and peculiar Construction. You deny the Fact, as indeed you may well be ashamed to own it. But I shall literally translate that Paragraph of your Book, and then the Reader may the more easily judge of it. " Hence it appears that *Athe-* " *nagoras*, with the Christians of the same Age, be- " lieved the Father only to be Θεὸν ἀγέννητον καὶ " ἀΐδιον, *God unbegotten and eternal*, and the Son of " God the Father to be stiled πρῶτον γέννημα, " *The first Off-spring*, ἐχ ὡς γενόμενον, not on the " account of any eternal Generation, properly so " called, such as might constitute the Son ζῶντα ἐν " ὑφεστῶτα, *living and subsisting* by Himself, in, or

* Πρῶτον γέννημα εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ, ἐχ ὡς γενόμενον, ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς, νοῦς ἀΐδιος ὤν, εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον ἀϊδίως λογικὸς ὤν. Athenag. c. 10. p. 38.

" out

" out of the Father; but becauſe the Father being " Himſelf an eternal Mind had from Eternity λόγον, " *Reaſon*, in Himſelf, ἀϊδίως λογικὸς ὤν, *being eter-* " *nally rational* *. The Reader muſt here obſerve that as you intermix *Greek* with your Sentences ſix Times, in the ſame manner; ſo in five of them, the Words immediately following the *Greek*, are plainly intended as the Conſtruction, or Interpretation of it. I had therefore good Reaſon, from parity of Circumſtances, to take the Words immediately following thoſe *Greek* Words οὐχ ὡς γενόμενον, as your Conſtruction, or Interpretation of Them: eſpecially ſince you begin with the *negative* Particle, juſt as the *Greek* does. You ſeem to be ſo ſenſible of This your ſelf, that when in your *Reply* (p. 14,) you come to give your *Engliſh* Reader a different Turn of the Paſſage, you are forced to leave the *Greek* Words οὐχ ὡς γενόμενον quite out: For had They appeared here in your *Reply*, as They do in your *Diſquiſitions*, the Reader would have ſeen at once that my Cenſure was juſt. But let us, for Argument ſake, admit your Plea, that you did not intend thoſe Words following *Athenagoras's Greek*, as an Interpretation of it; do you conſider how unaccountable a Part you have acted in citing the Words at all? They are Words which we greatly Value, and lay a Streſs upon, as being of irreſiſtible Force againſt the *Arians*. Ought you not, while you were pleading the Cauſe of *Arianiſm* from this very Paſſage, to have attempted ſome Solution of the Difficulty ariſing from thoſe Words, which ſo plainly ſtare you in the Face? *Sandius*, and *Gilbert Clerke* thought themſelves obliged to ſay ſomething, however weak and unſatisfactory; which was better than to attempt nothing at all. But what do you, if we are to take your own laſt

* Whitby. *Diſquiſit. Mod.* p. 62.

Thoughts

Thoughts upon it? You could not but know that these Words, in their obvious natural meaning, are directly repugnant to the Conclusion which you are aiming at; you see the very Words, you transcribe them, and leave them as you find them, without any Interpretation, or Solution. Now, what is This but to show that you was aware of the Objection, and was not able to answer it, nor so much as willing to endeavour it; and yet resolutely persist, even against Conviction, to wrest and force the Passage to your own Meaning? I am perswaded you might more prudently have submitted to the first Charge, than have took this way of getting rid of it. But it is frequent with you, for want of considering, to double the Fault which you hoped to excuse; and for the avoiding of one Difficulty, to run your self into more and greater.

To conclude this Article, if you intended an Interpretation of *Athenagoras*'s Words, as I conceive you did, then you have, in the whole, misrepresented the Author, but with something of Colour for it: if you did not, still you have, in the whole, misrepresented Him, and without any Colour for it. Either way, you have dealt unfairly with *Athenagoras*, and have endeavoured to impose upon your Readers.

XII. The next Thing I laid to your Charge *, was a ridiculous Representation † of *Tertullian*; as if *Tertullian* believed two *Angels* to be as much *one*, as God the Father and God the Son are. To this you reply (*p.* 21.) that you *say nothing of what* Tertullian *believed: but only from these Words* (the Son of God is called God from the Unity of Substance, for God is a Spirit) you *think it evident that* Tertullian *concludes hence the Unity of the Father, and the*

* *Defense*, p. 412.
† Disqu. Mod. p. 108.

Son,

*Son, that* They are Both Spirits; *which two* Angels, *and two* Demons *also are.* Is there then no regard to be had to what an Author is otherwise known to *believe*? Or is it fair and just to construe an *ambiguous* Sentence (supposing this *ambiguous*, and not rather plain enough against you) in direct Opposition to his certain undoubted Principles? But what makes it the more unjust in this Case, is, that *Tertullian*, in that very Paragraph, within a Line or two of the Words which you ground your Remark upon, resolves the Unity of Father and Son into This, that They are *de Spiritu Spiritus*, *de Deo Deus*, *de Lumine Lumen*; *Spirit of Spirit*, *God of God*, *Light of Light*. Can This be said of two *Angels*, or two *Demons*, that They are *Light of Light*, or *Spirit of Spirit*? Have They any such Relation to, or intimate Conjunction with, each other, as is here plainly signified of Father and Son? Well then; What is the Result? You have misunderstood *Tertullian*, or rather perverted his Meaning. He does not say that Father and Son are *One*, because *They are Both Spirits*; any more than He says they are One, because They are *Both Gods*: nor would it be sufficient for one to be *Spirit*, and the other to be *Spirit*, or one to be *God*, and the other *God*, unless one were also *of the other*, inseparably united to Him, and included in Him. *Tertullian* indeed observes that God the Father is *Spirit*, as He had before observed of God the Son:

* Et nos etiam *Sermoni*, atque *Rationi*, itemque *Virtuti* per quæ omnia molitum Deum ediximus, *propriam Substantiam Spiritum* inscribimus, cui & Sermo insit prænuntianti, & Ratio adsit disponenti, & Virtus præsit perficienti. Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, & prolatione generatum, & idcirco Filium Dei & Deum dictum ex unitate Substantiæ. Nam & Deus Spiritus: & cum radius ex sole porrigitur, portio ex summa: sed Sol erit in radio, quia Solis est radius, nec separatur Substantia sed extenditur. Ita *de Spiritu Spiritus*, & *de Deo Deus*, ut *Lumen de Lumine* accensum. *Tertull. Apol. c.* 21. *p.* 202, 203. Lugd.

And

And This was right, that so He might come to his Conclusion, that They are *Spirit of Spirit*; which They could not be, unless Each of them were *Spirit*. This therefore is mention'd, not because it makes them *One*, but because They could not be *One* without it. They must be *Spirit* and *Spirit*, to be *Spirit of Spirit*: But the latter contains more than the former; and it is into This that *Tertullian* resolves the formal Reason of the Unity; or rather, Both Considerations are included in his Notion of *Unity of Substance*. This will appear from a bare literal rendring of his Words. "We have learned that He *(God* "*the Son)* is *prolated*, and by his *Prolation generated*, "and *upon that Score*, He is stiled *Son of God*, and "*God*, from *Unity of Substance*. For even God *(the* "*Father)* is *Spirit*: And when a *Ray* is produced "from the *Sun*, a Portion from the whole, the *Sun* "is in the *Ray*, because it is the *Sun's Ray*; and the "*Substance is not separated*, but extended: in like "manner, here is *Spirit of Spirit*, and *God of God*, as "*Light of Light*. You see how *Tertullian* makes it necessary to *Unity of Substance*, that the *Substance* be not *separate*: And thus Father and Son are *One*, not meerly because Each of Them is *Spirit*, but because Both are *undivided* Substance, or Spirit; *Spirit of Spirit*. When I wrote my *Defense*, I thought a Hint might have been sufficient in Things of this Nature; little imagining I should ever have the Trouble of Explaining such Matters as these, which appear by their own light, upon a bare Inspection into the Author.

XIII. In the next Place, I charged you * with a Misconstruction of a noted Passage in *Irenaus*. To This you make no Reply at all; wherefore it stands as before; And I have, I suppose, your tacite Al-

* *Defense*, p. 412.

lowance to *Triumph* here, as, in a former place, your *expreſs* Permiſſion.

XIV. I found fault * with your Repreſentation † of *Tertullian*; as if that Writer believed God the Son to have been, in his higheſt Capacity, *ignorant of the Day of Judgment*. To this you make anſwer (*Reply*, p. 22.) That *you only cite his expreſs Words without any Deſcant upon Them*. It is very true that you make no formal *Deſcant* upon thoſe very Words; but both before and after, you are arguing, with all your might, againſt *Tertullian*'s belief of the *Eternity* and *Conſubſtantiality*. I hope, it is no Affront to ſuppoſe that you had ſome meaning in bringing in the Paſſages about the Son's *Ignorance*; and that you would have your Readers think them *pertinent*, at leaſt, to the Point in Hand. The whole deſign of your Book, and what goes before and after, in the ſame *Section*, ſufficiently ſhow your Intention in citing thoſe Paſſages; and are, interpretatively, a *Deſcant* upon Them. Your meaning and purport in it is ſo plain, that no Reader can miſtake it: Wherefore your pretence now that you have made no deſcant upon the Words, after you find that you are not able to defend your Senſe of Them, is a very poor Evaſion. There were two Citations from *Tertullian* about the Son's *Ignorance*. I had ſhown that one of them plainly relates to Chriſt's *Human* Nature; and I might reaſonably judge from thence the ſame thing of the other alſo, ſince Both are of the ſame Author. It is not therefore ſtrictly true that I *anſwer nothing*, as you pretend, to the firſt Citation: For, by anſwering one, I have, in effect, anſwer'd Both. It was your Buſineſs to prove that Either of the Paſſages were to be underſtood of Chriſt, in his higheſt Capacity: But for want of Proof, you are content to

* *Defenſe*, p. 414.

† Diſquiſ. Mod. p. 147.

*inſinuate*

*insinuate* it only, to your Reader; and so you leave it with Him, trusting to his Weakness, or Partiality. However, instead of asking a Proof of you, I gave you a Proof of the Contrary; demonstrating from the Context (especially from the Words *Exclamans quod se Deus reliquisset*, which *Tertullian* in express Words interprets of the *Human Nature*) that the supposed *Ignorance* of Christ was understood by *Tertullian* of Christ's *Humanity* only. Now you say (*p.* 22.) that *the Words*, known only to the Father, *exclude the Son in all Capacities*. Very well then; I had the good fortune to hit your meaning before, though you made no *Descant* upon the Words. As to your Pretence from the Term *only*, there is no Ground for it. No Man of any Judgment, that is at all acquainted with *Tertullian*'s way and manner of Explaining the *Exclusive* Terms *, relating to this Subject, would ever draw any such Inference from them. But you have a farther pretence, that *all the Words preceding speak not of the Son of Man, but of the Son of God*. The Reason is, because He was to prove that the *Son of God* was really distinct from the *Father*; and that the *Father* was not *incarnate*, as the *Praxeans* pretended. He proves it unanswerably from this Topic, among others; that in regard to the Son's *Ignorance of the Day of Judgment*, Father and Son are plainly spoken of, as of *two Persons*; one as *knowing*, the other as not *knowing*, tho' in a certain respect only: Wherefore the Father Himself was not the *Person incarnate*, which was to be proved. In this view, *Tertullian*'s Argument is just and conclusive; and the Text relating to the Son's *Ignorance pertinently* alledged, tho' understood of Christ's *Humanity*. This I observed before, and explain'd more at large in my *Defense*,

* Vid. Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 2. 5. 18, 19.

p. 415, 416, *&c.* You resolve, notwithstanding, to proceed in your own Way, and to make a show of saying Something, tho' you find your self already forecloſed, and every Objection obviated. You say thus: *From this Miſtake of* Tertullian's *citing Texts relating only to Chriſt's Human Nature, He ſaw this Objection would ariſe, that the Fathers argued impertinently againſt the* Sabellians. I did indeed foreſee, that there might be ſome Colour for ſuch an *Objection*, among Thoſe that take Things upon the *firſt View*, without looking any farther. I propoſed the *Objection* fairly, and then fully anſwered it; as the Reader may pleaſe to ſee in my *Defenſe*. And now, what have you to reply? I had ſaid that *Catholicks* and *Sabellians*, Both allowed that *God* was *incarnate*, and *that the main Queſtion* (that is, ſo far as concerns the *Incarnation*, whereof I was ſpeaking) *was, whether the Father Himſelf made one Perſon with Chriſt's Human Nature, or no.* In anſwer hereto, you make a ſhow of contradicting me without oppoſing me at all, except in one particular wherein you are plainly miſtaken. You run off for near a Page together, telling us only trite Things which every Body knows, concerning the Diſpute between *Catholicks* and *Sabellians*. If by *ſingular Eſſence*, be meant the ſame with *Hypoſtaſis*, or *Perſon* (as you underſtand it) That indeed was the main Article of Diſpute between *Catholicks* and *Sabellians*, whether Father and Son were one and the ſame *Hypoſtaſis*. But when the Principles of each Side were brought down to the particular Caſe of the *Incarnation*, then the main Point in Queſtion was, whether the *Hypoſtaſis* of the Father was *Incarnate*, or no. The *Sabellians* allowing but one *divine Hypoſtaſis*, and yet admitting God to be *Incarnate*, were of Courſe obliged to aſſert it: And the *Catholicks*, on the other Hand, admitting more *divine Hypoſtaſes* than one, denied it. How the *Catholicks*

*tholicks* proved their Point, I ſhowed you diſtinctly; and you have nothing of Moment to reply to it. Only you are pleaſed to acquaint us with an Invention of your own, that the *Sabellians allowed in Jeſus only Fleſh; and by the Spirit of Jeſus They underſtood the Godhead of the Father.* But who, before your ſelf, ever reckon'd it among the *Sabellian* Tenets, that Chriſt had no *Human Soul?* It is very peculiar of you to cite *Tertullian* in Proof of it, on account of theſe Words, *dicentes Filium Carnem eſſe, id eſt Hominem, id eſt Jeſum; Patrem autem Spiritum, id eſt Deum:* when *Tertullian,* in the very Paſſage, interprets *Fleſh* by *Man,* and *Jeſus*; and interprets *Spirit* by divine Spirit, or God. As to the Belief of Chriſt's *Human Soul,* it was an eſtabliſh'd Article of Faith in *Tertullian*'s Time, as appears from ſeveral Paſſages *; and before *Tertullian,* as is clear from *Irenæus* †, and *Juſtin Martyr* ‡. How then comes it to paſs that none of the *Catholicks* ever took notice of this Error of the *Sabellians,* their denying a *Human Soul?* I mention not how the *Sabellian Hypotheſis* muſt have been very needleſly and ſtupidly clogg'd by ſuch a Tenet: For They could never have given any tolerable Account of the Son's praying to the Father, of his increaſing in Wiſdom, of his being afflicted and ſore troubled, and crying out in his Agonies and Sufferings, without the Suppoſition of a *Human Soul.* What? Was it only *walking Fleſh,* or *animated Clay,* that did all this? Or was it the *Hypoſtaſis* of the Father, the eternal God, as ſuch, that did theſe Things? You allow only theſe Two; and not caring, it ſeems, how *ſtupid* and *ſenſeleſs* you make all the *Sabellians,* one of theſe you muſt, of Courſe, father upon Them. It is true that They ſuppoſed the *Father* to have *ſuffered,* and

* Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 16. 30. de Carn. Chriſti c. 10.
† Iren. l. 5. c. 1. p. 292. Ed. Bened.
‡ Juſtin. M. Apol. 2. p. 26. Ox.

They

They were therefore called *Patripassians:* That is, They supposed the *Father* to suffer (as we believe of the *Son*) in the *Human* Nature. But They were never so gross and wild in their Imaginations as to suppose the *Godhead*, as such, to *suffer*, to be *sore troubled*, to be in *Agonies*, to *cry out*, &c. And yet it is ridiculous to apply this to *Flesh* only without a *Soul:* Neither can it be reasonably imagined of the *Sabellians*, unless They believed of Men in general, that They have no such Thing as a *Soul* distinct from the Body. In short, their retreating at length to This, that there were two *Hypostases* * in Christ, a *Divine* and *Human*, in order to solve the Difficulties they were press'd with, sufficiently discovers their Sentiments. For neither could that Subterfuge do them any Service, unless *Jesus* was supposed a distinct *Person*; nor could They be so weak as to imagine a *living Carcass*, a Body without a Soul, to be a *Person*. To conclude this Article, the *Sabellians*, when They retired at length to that *Salvo*, taking Sanctuary in *two Hypostases*, understood one of them to be *God* the *Father*, the other, the *Man Christ Jesus* †: which was afterwards the Doctrine of *Paul* of *Samosata*, and of *Photinus*, who thus refined upon the *Sabellian Heresy*. But I have been rather too long in confuting a Pretence, which has nothing to countenance it in History; besides that it is plainly repugnant to good Sense.

XV. The next Thing I charged you with ‡, was your pretending, falsly, that Bp *Bull* had not shown that the Fathers of the *second Century* resolved the *Unity* into the same Principle with the *Nicene* Fathers. I observed that the Bishop had shown it,

* Vid. Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 27. *Comp.* Athanas. Contr. *Sabell.* Gregal. p. 29. Ed. Bened.

† *See this expresly asserted in* Athanasius, Tom. 2. p. 39. *before referr'd to.* ‡ *Defense*, p. 117.

referring

referring you to the Place where *. You now say in your *Reply* (p. 24.) *That which the Bishop has done in that Section is fully answered and refuted*, p. 197, 198. I have turn'd to those Pages, in your *Disquisitions*, and can see nothing like it; except it be your Fancy, or *Fiction*, that the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, when They speak of the *Logos* as existing in the Father before his coming forth, mean it of an *Attribute* only, and nothing *real*. This groundless Surmise is at large confuted by Bishop *Bull* †: And give me leave also to refer you to what I have observed ‡, on that Head. What you add, relating to *Clemens Romanus*, is only *gratis dictum*, and wants to be proved.

XVI. I blamed you ** farther for referring †† to *Basil*, as an Evidence that *Gregory Thaumaturgus* believed God the Son to be a *Creature*. You tell me, in your *Reply* (p. 24.) that you *say nothing of his* (*Gregory*'s) *Faith*. Please to look back to your *Modest Disquisitions*, and revise your own former Thoughts, which run thus. "Lastly, it is to be noted that "neither *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, who, as St. *Basil* "witnesseth, *depressed Christ into the Rank of Crea-* "*tures* (in Creaturarum censum depressit) nor *Dionysius* "of *Alexandria*, who, as the same (*Basil*) witnesseth, "denied the *Consubstantiality*, could have thought "rightly (*recte sentire potuisse*) of the proper Eter- "nity of Christ. Is this saying nothing of *Gregory*'s *Faith*? Tho' He *depressed* the Son into *the Rank of Creatures*, as you tell us He did; and tho' He could not *think* (i. e. *believe*) rightly of Christ's *proper Eternity*, as you also say; yet you have said nothing of *Gregory*'s *Faith*. Ridiculous: you have said it, and

* Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 4. c. 4.
† Bull. Def. Fid. Sect. 3. cap. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
‡ *Defense*, p. 148, &c. *Sermons*, p. 244.
** *Defense*, p. 418.
†† Mod. Disqu. p. 84.

quoted

quoted *Basil* for it; notwithstanding, that Bishop *Bull* had demonstrated the contrary even from *Basil* Himself; as I before observ'd, and you do not gainsay. And now, to use your own Words, relating to this Article, *Let the Reader judge where the Falshood lies.* Your repeating some Things from *Petavius* and *Huetius*, upon this Occasion, signifies little. Bishop *Bull* had considered, and answer'd what those two great Men had said: And you come up again with the same baffled Objections; though you are so sensible that They have been fully answer'd, that you have not a Word to reply, but are forced *tacitely* to allow that *Gregory's Faith* was right; however He happen'd to drop some suspected Words, which were made an ill use of.

XVII. I charged you * with the Revival of an old Objection, which Bishop *Bull* had ingenuously set forth in its full Force, and as fully answer'd †.

To this you reply *(p. 25.)* that you *have fully confuted this pretended Answer of the* Bishop's, *in* your *Dissertation* de Scriptur. Interpret. *p.* 51, 52. and also in the place cited of your *Mod. Disquis.* p. 87, 88. I have turn'd to your *Dissertation*, and find what you point to, in the *Preface*, p. 51, 52. There I meet with two or three Exceptions, mostly wide of the Point, and scarce deserving Notice. We must suppose our Readers acquainted with the Argument we are upon, which it would be tedious to give at length: And now I will show you how slight your Objections are.

1. First, you say, that the *Appearance of Christ's Divine Nature* (to the Patriarchs) *under Human Form, did not make the Logos* another God *from the Father.* No certainly; Nor did any of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers

* *Defense.* p. 418.
† Bull. Def. Fid. N. p. 267.

pretend

pretend it: But if the *Logos appeared* in a certain Manner and Form, and the *Father* never *appeared* in any Manner or Form; the *Logos* is not the *Father*: which was the Thing to be proved.

2. You object, that *certainly the divine Nature of Christ was in Heaven, when it appeared on Earth.* Undoubtedly: And those very Writers who represent the *Father* as being in Heaven, and the *Son* as being on Earth, yet acknowledge them Both to be equally present every where: And They refer it to the οἰκονομία *, that the two Persons are represented as it were in different Places; one Here, the other There.

3. You object, that *those Antients who look'd upon it as* impious *to ascribe to the Father such Things as they made no scruple of applying to the Son,* must have thought *there was some difference between the Father and Son, in those Respects.* I answer, that They thought of no more Difference than This, that one was a *Father*, and the other a *Son*; and that one was to be *incarnate*, and the other not. It would have been *impious* to ascribe to the Person of the *Father*, what was proper to the Person of the *Son*; not only because the *Father* was never to be *sent*, nor to act a *ministerial* Part, any more than He was to be *Incarnate*; but also because the Tendency of such Pretences was to make Father and Son one *Hypostasis*, or *Person*, and was in reality to deny that there was any *Son* at all. Your Citations from *Tertullian* and *Justin Martyr* are not pertinent, unless you supposed your self to be arguing against *Sabellians*. Having done

* Habes Filium in Terris, habes Patrem in Cælis: non est separatio ista, sed *Dispositio* divina. Cæterum scias Deum etiam intra Abyssos esse, & ubique consistere, sed vi & potestate: Filium quoque ut individuum cum ipso ubique. Tamen in ipsa οἰκονομίᾳ Pater voluit Filium in Terris haberi, se vero in Cælis. *Tertull. adv. Prax.* cap. 2.

with your *Diſſertation*, let us next come to *Diſquiſ. Modeſt.* p. 87. There, I muſt obſerve, you have hardly one word to the purpoſe. All that you prove, is, that Father and Son are not one *Numerical Eſſence*, in your Senſe; that is, They are not one *Numerical Perſon*, which is readily allowed: As alſo that They have not one *Numerical* Will, Power, *&c.* in your Senſe, tho' They have in Another. *Voluntas de Voluntate, Potentia de Potentia* is the *Catholick* Doctrine, as much as *Subſtantia de Subſtantia*, or *Deus de Deo*. In ſhort, if you would do any thing towards confuting Biſhop *Bull*, you ſhould anſwer the Authorities which He brought, to prove that thoſe very *Ante-Nicene* Writers (who argued that it could not be the Father that *appeared*, and *deſcended*, and was found in a *place*) acknowledged, notwithſtanding, that the *Son* was, in his own Nature, *inviſible*, and *omnipreſent* as well as the Father; and that the ſame Writers (ſome of them) expreſly interpreted thoſe *Appearances*, &c. of the οἰκονομία, *Oeconomy*, or *Diſpenſation*, which it pleaſed God the Son to run through; tranſacting all Matters between God the Father, and the World of *Creatures*. As to the οἰκονομία, and what Biſhop *Bull* intends by it, the Reader may ſee in his *Defenſe* of the *Nicene-Faith*, (p. 10.) What you mean by denying it is very hard to conjecture, unleſs you have ſome weak Evaſion (*Reply*, p. 26.) in the Words, *Beginning from the fall of Adam:* For you ſay, and ſeem to lay ſome Streſs upon it, that *it began from the Beginning of the Creation*. Does Biſhop *Bull* deny That? See his own Words, in the Margin *. But, it ſeems, you are to conſtrue Biſhop *Bull*'s ſaying, that it was as *high*

* Deus Pater, quemadmodum per Filium ſuum mundum primitus condidit creavitque; ita per eundem Filium ſe deinceps mundo patefecit. *Bull. Def. F. N.* p. 10.

as

*as the Fall of Adam,* (in Oppoſition to ſuch as ſuppoſed it to commence at the *Incarnation*, and no ſooner) as if He had ſaid it *began* from the Fall of *Adam*: And This you are to do, only to find ſome Pretence for contradicting Biſhop *Bull*, and diverting the Reader from the Point in Hand. I referred you (*Defenſe*, p. 418.) to Authors *, Antient and Modern, who aſſerted the οἰκονομία in Biſhop *Bull*'s Senſe. To which you have nothing of any moment to oppoſe; only you diſcover a great Diſſatisfaction that Biſhop *Bull* had ſo well guarded his Point, and vindicated his Doctrine, that all your moſt pompous and plauſible Pretences fall before Him.

XVIII. I charged you † with ſetting *Clemens* of *Rome*, and St. *Paul*, at Variance; and yet giving the Preference to *Clemens*, as *laying Chriſtianity before us in its naked Simplicity*. To this Article you are pleaſed to ſay never a Word.

XIX. I took notice alſo, in another place ‡, of your Sophiſtical way of reaſoning againſt the Belief of *Myſteries*, or Matters above Comprehenſion. I called upon you (*p.* 318, 319.) to explain your Meaning, and to let us know diſtinctly, what there is in the Doctrine of the ever Bleſſed Trinity, to give you ſuch Offenſe, and to raiſe your Zeal againſt it; whether it be that the Doctrine is, in your Judgment, *Contradictory* to Reaſon, or only *above Reaſon*; or that it is *unſcriptural* only, and no more: But to This alſo you vouchſafe no Reply.

XX. I charged you farther (*p.* 131.) with uſing a bad Art, to ſerve a bad Cauſe: which was the ſevereſt Thing I had ſaid of you, and which you had

* Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 2, 3. Clem. Alex. p. 831. 955. Ed. Ox. Tatian. c. 8. Ed. Ox. Hippol. Contr. Noet. p. 12. 15. Fabric. Valeſ. Not. in Euſeb. p. 5, 6. 90. 253.

† *Defenſe*, p. 420.

‡ *Defenſe*, p. 308.

given me juſt occaſion for; as I ſhowed plainly in the place referr'd to. In Apology for your ſelf (*Reply*, p. 56.) you cite a Paſſage of my *Defenſe*, (p. 433.) where I ſay, " A Writer is not to be " blamed, in ſome Caſes, for taking what is to his " purpoſe, and omitting the reſt. To which give me leave to anſwer in my own Words, as they follow in the ſame Page; " But, as the Caſe is here, " the beſt, and indeed only light to direct the Rea- " der to the true meaning of what is cited, is left out. You ſay, your *deſign being only to prove from the Words of* Juſtin, *that Chriſt was God,* κατὰ βελὴν αὐτοῦ, according to the Will of his Father, *what Reaſon could you have to add that He was alſo ſtiled an Angel?* But, do you not yet perceive that the Queſtion is, whether Chriſt be ſaid to be God κατὰ βελὴν αὐτοῦ, *according to the Will of the Father*, in that Place of *Juſtin*, or no? The Words, literally rendred, run thus: " Who according to his (the Father's) Will, " is both God, being his Son, and an Angel as mi- " niſtring to his Father's Will. The meaning of the Paſſage is not, as you repreſent it, that Chriſt is *God, by the Will of the Father* (tho' even That might bear a good Senſe) but that it pleaſed God that his Son, who was *God* already, as *God's Son*, ſhould be an *Angel* alſo. That He was *God*, was a neceſſary Thing; but that He ſhould be *Both*, was not ſo. This I took to be the true Senſe of the Paſſage. For, *Juſtin* gives the Reaſon why He was *God*; it was becauſe He was *God's Son*. He reſolves his *Di-*

* Τὸν κατὰ βελὴν τὴν ἐκείνου καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα, ὑὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄγγελον ἐν τῇ ὑπηρετεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ. Dial. p. 370.

*Compare the Words of* Novatian.

Perſonæ autem Chriſti convenit, ut & Deus ſit, quia Dei Filius; & Angelus ſit, quoniam paternæ Diſpoſitionis Adnunciator eſt. *Novat.* c. 26.

*vinity*

*vinity* into *Sonſhip* here, as indeed every where; and *Sonſhip* into *Communication of Subſtance*, as I have obſerved above. Now, let us conſider what you had done with this Paſſage. The *Latin* Verſion runs thus: *Qui juxta Voluntatem ejus, & Deus eſt, Filius quippe Ipſius, & Angelus ex eo quod ſententiæ illius eſt adminiſter.* Inſtead whereof you give us This: *Qui ex Voluntate Ipſius, & Deus eſt & Filius ipſius.* Here, by putting in the Particle *Et*, before *Filius*, and leaving out *& Angelus*, you determine the Words to your own Senſe, tho' capable of another Senſe as they lie in the Author. This is what I had juſt reaſon to complain of, that you ſhould take upon you to leave out, and put in, what you pleaſe, to tie the Words down to your own Meaning; when the Words otherwiſe may, or rather muſt, bear a different Conſtruction, if you pleaſe to let them appear intire, and without any Interpolation.

You ſay (*Reply*, p. 56,) that you *had Authority* from Juſtin's *own Words to do this.* What? Had you Authority from *Juſtin*'s own Words, to change both his Words and his Senſe? He does not ſay that Chriſt *was God, and a Son too by the Will of the Father*; but that He was, according to the Will of the Father, both God, as being his Son, and an Angel. I inſiſt upon it, that the meaning may be no more than this, that it pleaſed God that He who was already God, ſhould not only be *God*, but an *Angel* alſo; and that tho' it was owing to God's good Pleaſure, that He was *Both*, yet it was neceſſary for Him to be *one*, as He was partaker of the divine Subſtance, being God's Son. You cite other Paſſages of *Juſtin*, declaring that Chriſt was Θεὸς ὢν τῷ εἶναι τέκνον πρωτότοκον τῶν ὅλων κτισμάτων, *God as being Born* (or begotten) *before all Creatures*: and that He was

* Whitby. *Diſquiſit. Med.* p. 32.

Θεὸς,

Θεὸς, Θεὸς ὢν ὑπάρχων, *God as being the Son of God.* Now, these and the like Passages make against you, as showing that *Justin* resolved Christ's *Divinity* into his *Sonship*, that is, *Communion* of *Essence*, or *Substance* *, not into *voluntary Appointment*. If it be objected that He was a *Son* κατὰ βουλὴν according to *Justin*, and that therefore He must be God κατὰ βουλὴν, if He be *God* as *God's Son*; I answer, that the Consequence is not just. For while *Justin* understands the *Sonship* of a *Temporal* and *Voluntary* προβολὴ, or *coming forth*, He supposes the *Logos* not to have been ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, but from the very Substance of the Father; and therefore He was *God*, as having ever existed before his *coming forth*, in and with the Father. In a word, He *came forth*, was not *created*, and therefore He is *God*. Had He been produced *from nothing*, as Creatures are, He could not be God: But since He came forth as a *Son*, of the same divine Substance with the Father, therefore He is *God*. This I take to be the true Account of *Justin*'s Principles relating to this Head; as also of all the other Fathers that speak of a *voluntary* Generation. See my *Defense*, Qu. 8. You see then, how wide a difference there is between your Account of *Justin* and mine. I desire only to have *Justin*'s Text fairly represented as it is. To put in, or leave out any thing here, and thereby to determine the Sense against us, in so critical a Place as This, is very unfair and unjust; and deserves the hardest Names that I could give it. Let us have no Tampering with Texts. You may argue and reason for your Sense of the Passage, if you please; as I do also for mine. Only let our Readers see plainly what the Words of the Author are.

* Vid. Justin. Dial. p. 183. 373. *Comp.* Apol. 1. p. 44. 46. Apol. 2. p. 13.

To

To do otherwiſe is corrupting the Evidence, perverting Judgment, and giving Sentence before the Cauſe comes to a fair Hearing. This kind of Management, eſpecially in ſo weighty a Cauſe, wherein the Honour of our *God* and *Saviour* is ſo nearly concern'd, is what I cannot account for: And if, upon this Occaſion I expreſs'd ſome Wonder and Aſtoniſhment, that any ſhould be ſo *reſolutely eager to ungod their Saviour, as not to permit the Cauſe to have a fair Hearing*; I ſuppoſe, it might become me much better in Defenſe of my Saviour's Honour, than Thoſe intemperate Words of your's, *Impudently falſe Aſſertion*, become you, in your blind Zeal for your own.

I have now finiſh'd what I intended by way of Anſwer to your *Defenſive* Part. Upon the whole, it does not appear to me, that, of all the Things laid to your Charge, whether *general Fallacies*, or *particular Miſtakes*, you have been able to take off ſo much as one. What you have done, or ſhall do, in the *Offenſive* Way, may perhaps be conſider'd hereafter. I think it beſt to *poſtpone* my *Second Part*, becauſe you are ſtill going on to ſupply me with new Matter for it: And you have promiſed the Publick great Things, to appear in due Time. I am now pretty well acquainted with you; and may therefore preſume to exhibite to the Reader, or to your Self, a brief Account of your chief Materials, with which you are to work in this Controverſy, and upon which your Cauſe is to ſubſiſt.

1. In the firſt place, you have a ſtrong *Preſumption*, that *Two, or more Perſons cannot conſtitute one Individual, or Numerical Being, Subſtance, or Eſſence.* You produce Teſtimonies of *Fathers* in great Numbers, proving Nothing but a *real* Diſtinction; and by Virtue of the *Preſumption* laid down (which ſtands only upon *Courteſy*) you perſwade your ſelf, that thoſe Teſti-

Teſtimonies are of ſome weight, and pertinently alledged, even againſt Thoſe who admit a *real* Diſtinction, as much as the *Fathers* do.

2. In the ſecond place, you have another ſtrong *Preſumption*, that no kind of *Subordination is or can be conſiſtent with ſuch Equality, or ſuch Union as we maintain.* Hereupon you produce a farther Cloud of Teſtimonies from the *Antients*, proving nothing but a *Subordination:* which Teſtimonies, by virtue of this your ſecond *Preſumption* (ſtanding only upon *Courteſy*, as the former) are conceived to be of Weight, and to be pertinently cited, even againſt Thoſe who readily admit of a *Subordination*, in Conformity with the Antient Fathers. From what I have obſerved here, and under the former Article, you may perceive that, at leaſt, nine Parts in ten of your Quotations are intirely wide of the Point; and it may ſave you ſome trouble for the future, to be duly apprized of it.

3. Beſides this, you have ſome Expreſſions of *Origen*, chiefly from thoſe Pieces which are either not certainly Genuine, or not free from Interpolation *, or wrote in a Problematical Way †, or not containing *Origen*'s mature and riper Thoughts; publiſhed perhaps without his Conſent, and ſuch as He Himſelf afterwards diſapproved, and repented of ‡. And thoſe you urge againſt us, notwithſtanding that we appeal chiefly to his Book againſt *Celſus*, which is certainly *Origen*'s, and which contains his moſt mature Sentiments; and from whence it is demonſtrable that *Origen* was no *Arian*, but plainly *Anti-Arian* **.

* Vid. *Ruffin.* de Adulter. librorum Origen. p. 240. Ed. Bened. Huet. Origenian. p. 233.

† Vid. *Pamph.* Apolog. p. 221. Ed. Bened. Phot. Cod. 117. *Athanaſ.* Vol. 1. p. 233.

‡ Vid. *Hieron.* de Error. Orig. ad Pammach. Ep. 41. p. 347. Ed. Bened.

** Vid. *Bull.* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 2. c. 9.

4. In

4. You lay a very great Stress upon *Eusebius*, as if He were to speak for all the *Ante-Nicene* Writers: tho' we might more justly produce *Athanasius* (with respect to his Two first Tracts) as an *Ante-Nicene* Writer; And his Authority is, at least, as good as the other's. *Eusebius* must be of little weight with us, wherever He is found to vary either from Himself, or from the *Catholicks* which lived in, or before his Time. Nothing can be more unfair than to represent Antiquity through the Glass of *Eusebius*, who has been so much suspected; Besides that we can more certainly determine what the Sentiments of the earlier Writers were (from their own Works still extant) than we can what *Eusebius*'s were; whose Writings are more doubtful and ambiguous; insomuch that the learned World have been more divided about Him and his Opinions, than about any other Writer whatsoever.

5. Lastly, You bring up again, frequently, some Concessions of *Petavius* and *Huetius*; such as They uncautiously fell into, before this Matter had been thoroughly canvass'd, as it hath been since by Bishop *Bull*, and other great Men. From that Time, most of the learned Men in *Europe*, *Romanists* * as well as *Protestants*, appear to have the same Sentiments of the *Ante-Nicene Faith*, which Bishop *Bull* had. It is therefore now much out of Time, and very disingenuous to lay any great Weight upon the Judgment of *Petavius*, or *Huetius*, however valuable and learned, since this Matter has been much more accurately inquir'd into, than it had been at that Time. *Huetius* has lived to see Bishop *Bull*'s Works (as we may reasonably presume) and cannot be ignorant how highly They have been valued Abroad: Yet we do not find that He has ever complain'd of

* *See* Nelson's *Life of Bishop* Bull, *p.* 345. *&c.* 388.

any Injury done Him by the Biſhop, or that He ever thought fit to vindicate Himſelf, or his great Oracle *Petavius*; to whoſe Judgment (as He Himſelf laments) He had once dearly paid too great a Deference *.

It may ſuffice, for the preſent, to have left theſe few general Hints; by means of which an Intelligent Reader, without farther Aſſiſtance from Me, may readily diſcover the Fallacy of your Reaſonings, and anſwer the moſt plauſible Objections you have to urge againſt the received Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity. If any thing more particular be neceſſary hereafter, I ſhall (with God's Aſſiſtance) endeavor to do Juſtice to the Cauſe which I have taken in Hand; and, as opportunity ſerves, ſhall proceed in detecting Sophiſtry, laying open Diſguiſes, expoſing Miſreports, Miſquotations, Miſconſtructions, or any other Engines of Deceit, as long as there appears to Me any probable Danger from thence ariſing to Honeſt Well-meaning Men, leſs acquainted with this momentous Controverſy. In the Interim, I am with all due Reſpect,

*SIR*,

*Your moſt Humble Servant.*

* Vid. *Huetii* Comment. de Rebus ad illum pertinent, *p.* 70.

ERRATA.

Pag. 11. line 17. for *or* read *and*.
p. 43. l. 12. for ἀπάντων read ἁπάντων.

BOOKS Printed for, and Sold by CORN. CROWNFIELD, at *Cambridge*.

A *Vindication of Christ's Divinity: Being a Defense of some Queries, relating to Dr.* Clarke's *Scheme of the Holy Trinity, in answer to a Clergy-Man in the Country. The Third Edition,* Octavo 1720.

*Eight Sermons Preach'd at the Cathedral Church of St.* Paul, *in Defense of the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; upon the Encouragement given by the Lady* Moyer, *and at the Appointment of the Lord Bishop of* London. *With a Preface containing Remarks upon Two late Pamphlets: One Intit'led, Modest Plea,* &c. *Continued,* &c. *The other, Unity of God not inconsistent with the Divinity of Christ,* &c. *Both by* Daniel Waterland, *D. D. Master of Magdalen College in* Cambridge, *and Chaplain in Ordinary to His MAJESTY. The Second Edition,* Octavo 1720.

*Twenty two Sermons on several Subjects, By Dr.* Creyghton, *Canon-Residentiary of* Wells, *late* Greek *Professor of* Cambridge. Octavo 1720.

*Remarks upon a late Discourse of Free-Thinking: In a Letter to* F. H. *D. D. by* Phileleutherus Lipsiensis. *In Two Parts. The Fifth Edition.*

C. Julii Cæsaris quæ exstant Omnia. Ex Recensione *Joannis Davisii*, cum ejusdem Animadversionibus ac Notis Pet. Ciaconii, Fr. Hotomanni, Joan. Brantii, Dionys. Vossii & aliorum. Accessere Metaphrasis Græca Librorum VII. De Bello Gallico, nec non Indices necessarii. *Quarto* 1706.

M. Minucii Felicis Octavius, ex itera Recensione *Joannis Davisii*, cum ejusdem Animadversionibus, ac Notis Integris Des. Heraldi & Nic. Rigaltii, nec non Selectis aliorum. Accedit Commodianus, Ævi Cyprianici Scriptor, cum Observationibus antehac Editis, aliisque nonnullis, quæ jam primum prodeunt. *Octavo*, 1712.

M. Tullii

M. Tullii Ciceronis de Natura Deorum libri Tres. Cum notis integris Paulli Manucii, Petri Victorii, Joachimi Camerarii, Dionyſ. Lambini, & Fulv. Urſini. Recenſuit, ſuiſque Animadverſionibus Illuſtravit ac Emaculavit *Joannes Daviſius*, L. L. D. Coll. Regin. Cantab. Magiſter, & Canonicus Elienſis. Accedunt Emendationes Cl. *Joannis Walkeri*, A. M. Coll. Trin. Socii. 1718.

Lactantii Firmiani Epitome Divinarum Inſtitutionum ad Pentadium Fratrem. Eam ex vetuſtiſſimo MSto Taurinenſi nuper editam recenſuit, & ſuis animadverſionibus illuſtravit, ac emendavit *Joannes Daviſius*, Juris & Theologiæ Doctor C. R. C. M. C. E. *Octavo* 1718.

Suidæ Lexicon, Græce & Latine. Textum Græcum cum Manuſcriptis Codicibus collatum a quamplurimis mendis purgavit, Notiſque perpetuis illuſtravit: Verſionem Latinam Æmilii Porti innumeris in locis correxit; Indiceſque Auctorum & Rerum adjecit *Ludolphus Kuſterus*, Profeſſor humaniorum literarum in Gymnaſio Regio Berolinenſi. 3. Vol. *Folio*, 1710.

C. Criſpi Salluſtii quæ extant; cum Notis Integris Glareani, Rivii, Ciacconii, Gruteri, Carrionis, Manutii, Putſchii, Douſæ; Selectis Caſtilionei, C. & A. Popmæ, Palmerii, Urſini, J. Fr. Gronovii, Victorii, *&c.* Accedunt Julius Exſuperantius, Porcius Latro: & Fragmenta Hiſtoricorum Vett. cum Notis A. Popmae. Recenſuit, Notas perpetuas, & Indices adjecit *Joſephus Waſſe*, Coll. Regin. apud Cantab. Socius; & Nobiliſſ. Marchioni de Kent a Sacris Domeſticis. Praemittitur Salluſtii Vita, Auctore V. Cl. *Joanne Clerico*. Quarto, 1710.

Q. Horatius Flaccus ad nuperam *Richardi Bentleii* Editionem accurate expreſſus. Notas addidit *Thomas Bentleius*, A. B. Collegii S. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienſes Alumnus. *Octavo*, 1713.